

NOV 24 1947

VOL. LXVIII, 4

WHOLE No. 272

*desk*

AMERICAN  
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by  
HENRY T. ROWELL

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

KEMP MALONE, BENJAMIN D. MERITT

JAMES H. OLIVER

EVELYN H. CLIFT: Secretary

Honorary Editor  
DAVID M. ROBINSON

OCTOBER, 1947

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND  
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Horace's First Roman Ode. By FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN, - - -	337
Syria and Cilicia. By ELIAS J. BICKERMAN, - - -	353
Aristotle's Four Species of Tragedy ( <i>Poetics</i> 18) and their Importance for Dramatic Criticism. By ALLAN H. GILBERT, -	363
Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius of Pompeii. By A. W. VAN BUREN, -	382
Catullus' <i>Attis</i> . By JOHN P. ELDER, - - -	394
Aristotle's Presuppositions about Change. By GEORGE BOAS, -	404
The Etymology of <i>Botargo</i> . By JOHN P. HUGHES and R. GORDON WASSON, - - -	414
REVIEWS: - - -	419
<i>Dunkin's</i> Post-Aristophanic Comedy. Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at both Athens and Rome (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH).— <i>Newell's</i> The Byzantine Hoard of Lagbe (PAUL A. CLEMENT).— <i>Norberg's</i> L'Olympionique, le Poète, et leur Renom éternel. Contribution à l'étude de l'ode I, 1 d'Horace (GILBERT NORWOOD).— <i>Wagner's</i> Rufinus, the Translator: A Study of his Theory and his Practice as illustrated in his Version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory Nazianzen (WILLIAM C. BARK).— <i>Jasny's</i> The Wheats of Classical Antiquity (G. RAYNOR THOMPSON).— <i>Trell's</i> The Temple of Artemis at Ephesos (WILLIAM B. DINSMOOR).— <i>Björck's</i> Apsyrus, Julius Africanus et l'Hippiatrique Grecque (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN).— <i>Festugière's</i> La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'Astrologie et les Sciences Occultes (ELIAS J. BICKERMAN).— <i>Vandvik's</i> National Admixture in Medieval Latin (STEFÁN EINARSSON).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - -	449
INDEX TO VOLUME LXVIII, - - -	454

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Henry T. Rowell; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. LXVIII, 4

WHOLE NO. 272

---

## HORACE'S FIRST ROMAN ODE.

If anyone were to wonder whether the first six odes of Book III were regarded as a unit by the poet himself his doubts would be dispelled by the four opening lines of the first ode which clearly introduce not this poem only but a series of poems: *carmina non prius audita*. The plural must be taken literally. Throughout the whole group of poems we are listening to the solemn and inspiring message of the *Musarum sacerdos* aiming to fill Rome's youth with a new pride and a new consciousness of its mission and obligations. That the cycle of "Roman Odes" was written at the suggestion of Augustus is a gratuitous assumption but that these poems have sprung from the poet's deep and serious concern over the political prospects of his country—*nunc desiderium curaque non levis*—is a fact too obvious to need proof or discussion. Curiously, the only poem of the group whose political character and purpose may be questioned is the first—the same that opens with the stanza announcing *carmina non prius audita*. In contrast to the others, *Ode* III, 1 is "philosophical" rather than political: while the others relate the moral issues with which they deal to the state this one remains definitely within the sphere of "private ethics." It is built around the realization that wealth and ambitions contribute nothing to a man's peace of mind, that a modest style of life and contentment with little are a much surer way to happiness, and if any ideas in Horace's *Odes* can be regarded as a true expression of the poet's own approach to life and the goal of life these are certainly among them. These are the ideas which enabled Horace to find his own self in the *Satires*, which accompany him from the *Satires* into the *Odes* and which finally reappear in many of

his *Epistles* where as a matter of fact they show but few traces of having passed through a much nobler poetic genre.<sup>1</sup>

Aspirations—also political aspiration—are futile, distinctions illusory because Death changes inequalities to equality.<sup>2</sup> This thought is familiar to us from many other odes in which Horace is speaking as a pupil of Hellenistic philosophers and moralists, not at all as *vates* of the Augustan Empire.<sup>3</sup> We need only look at the next ode (III, 2) to realize that the “patriotic” approach to Death is quite different.<sup>4</sup> And does not the reference at the end of *Ode* III, 1 to the *vallis Sabina*<sup>5</sup> remove the last doubt that this time too Horace is expounding his private philosophy of life? He seems to be urging the young Romans to strive for their individual happiness—in the same way in which he himself has found his—rather than helping them to become devoted citizens of the new Rome which Augustus is anxious to build up.

It is probably this unique quality of *Ode* III, 1<sup>6</sup> which has given rise to some theories. I do not know whether Warde Fowler felt a discrepancy between the proem and the content of this ode. Noticing that the first stanza is meant to be an introduction to the whole group and that there is nothing in the body of the poem that echoes, or in any way refers to, this stanza he threw out the suggestion that “this curious little preface was placed where it is when the six odes were collected” and proceeded to assert that “the first ode might begin quite naturally and after Horace’s familiar manner with the fifth line.”<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Epist.*, I, 7, 27, *ire tamen restat Numa quo devenit et Ancus* may be mentioned although the closest parallel to it is found in *Odes*, IV, 7 (15), a poem which is likely to be later than the epistle. Eduard Fraenkel, *Sitzb. Heidelb. Akad.*, 1933, p. 5, n. 3, compares *Epist.*, I, 1, 68 ff., 11, 22 ff. and a few other passages with *Odes*, III, 29, 44 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Lines 9-15.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 347.

<sup>4</sup> *Dulce et decorum*, etc. (III, 2, 13 ff.). Cf. also III, 5, 13 ff., IV, 9, 51 f.

<sup>5</sup> To be sure, Horace speaks of himself also in the fourth “Roman Ode” (lines 5 ff.), yet in spite of “biographical” details the Horace of that ode is very different from the man of whom the last stanza of our poem gives us a glimpse. He is identical with the Horace of our first stanza. Cf. Giorgio Pasquali, *Orazio Lirico* (Bari, 1920), p. 667.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Richard Heinze, *Vom Geiste des Römertums* (Leipzig, 1936), p. 226.

<sup>7</sup> *Roman Essays and Interpretations* (Oxford, 1920), p. 211. See also



Evidently if Warde Fowler is right the poem need not have been written as one of the "Roman Odes"; it might be a "private" poem comparable to, say, *Nullus argento color est* or *Otium divos rogat*. To be sure, III, 1 has no individual addressee and it would be awkward to suppose that the Horatian vocative was excised when Horace decided to use the ode for a grander purpose and that the gap was somehow covered up. Fortunately we need not enter upon such speculations, for Warde Fowler's theory cannot survive a serious examination. According to him, line 5 "would be a beginning" in "Horace's familiar manner." Yet, where, it may be asked, does one find in the corpus of Horace's poetry an ode recommending moderation of man's desires that begins with verses comparable to

Regum timendorum in proprios greges  
Reges in ipsos imperium est Jovis  
Clari giganteo triumpho  
Cuncta supercilio moventis.

Clearly, the poetic diction has here been raised to a *ἄψος* practically unparalleled in the first three books of *Odes*—except for the group of poems of which we are speaking. The monumental quality of the diction is in keeping with the announcement of *carmina non prius audita* as well as with Horace's self-introduction as *Musarum sacerdos*. Warde Fowler's fundamental mistake was to neglect the evidence afforded by the style—the "form"—of the poem. The same poetic mood and the same confident and exalted feeling that inform the first stanza also inspire the others; all bear witness to the poet's disdain for fashions and fads, and their solemn wording keeps up the *Pathos der Distanz*—to use a Nietzschean phrase—which the first stanza creates by its use of awe-inspiring religious language.<sup>8</sup>

This means that whatever view one may take of the origin of the other "Roman Odes" and of the growth of the series as

Willy Theiler, *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswiss. Kl.*, XII (1935-36), pp. 276 f., who plays with the idea that this ode originally had a different proem.

<sup>8</sup> On the style of the ode see further pp. 350 ff. below. It seems arguable that Horace tones down his diction somewhat where he speaks of the *somnus agrestium lenis virorum* (lines 21 ff.), making it—in conformity with the subject—more *lene*, less *δεινόν*, as Greek writers on style might say.

such<sup>9</sup> the first must have been conceived as the poem that was to head the series since its first lines which are an organic part of it actually open and announce the series. The plea for a moderation of man's worldly ambitions was to be the first part of Horace's grand message to the nation.

It is probable that the reader of Horace who approaches these odes naively and without knowledge of the scholarly controversies feels, more or less vaguely, the significance of this arrangement. What we shall try to do on the following pages is to bring the rational approach into harmony with the instinctive responses. If rightly interpreted, the ode should help not a little towards a better understanding of Horace's personality,—one might almost say, of his dual personality inasmuch as some of our contemporaries appear to know two different Horaces, almost at war with each other: on the one side the Horace of the Sabine farm, a confirmed individualist spending most of his time in self-education, on the other the *vates*—or propagandist—of the Augustan Empire.<sup>10</sup> Before the question "which is the true Horace?" becomes an obsession with us it may be well to consider what kind of clue our ode offers to the intrinsic connection and relationship between the two sides of his personality which modern criticism has done its best to split apart.

To see *Ode III, 1* against the right background and in the right perspective, certain facts concerning the relation between Horace's poetry and philosophy should be borne in mind. It has already been said that the idea of being satisfied with little and renouncing the unreasonable ambitions to which most men are slaves forms the core of Horace's personal philosophy. It is this idea which, adapted to a variety of situations and settings, provides time and again the theme for his satires.<sup>11</sup> When

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the judicious discussion of the problem by R. Heinze, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 ff. Heinze also gives a brief history of the question, p. 215.

<sup>10</sup> See for the latest statement of an opinion L. P. Wilkinson's attractive book *Horace and His Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge, 1945), pp. 64 ff., 82 ff. Opposite sides on the question are taken by L. Dalmasso, *L'Opera di Augusto e la posizione artistica di Orazio* (Turin, 1934) and E. Turolla, *Orazio* (Florence, 1931; see p. 6, n. 1 for references to some other appraisals and to a divergence of opinions). See also for an extreme position (Horace as *vates*) A. Y. Campbell, *Horace, A New Interpretation* (London, 1924), pp. 26 ff., 56 ff., 101 ff., and *passim*.

<sup>11</sup> *Sat.*, I, 1; 4; 6; II, 2; 3; 5; 6; 7. A subject closely related to ours,

Horace began to write odes. Moderation was one of the subjects for which he could find little or no precedent in Alcaeus, Sappho, and Anacreon. The tradition of Greek lyrics, however, determines the form and style even of those poems whose topics are not legitimized by the authority of these great names but reflect an essential phase of Horace's own *βίος*.<sup>12</sup> Technical jargon being unsuited and the illustrations used by the diatribe not dignified enough, Horace had to create a language which should be concrete and vigorous and at the same time adequate to the ethical doctrine. The drastic illustrations, the humorous bon-hommie, and the colloquial idiom of the *Satires* had to give way to impressive symbols, to grave and solemn stateliness, to majestic and sonorous diction. In the *Odes*, there is no *ingens frumenti acervus*, no *stragula vestis*, *tinearum et blatearum epula*, no *uncta satis pingui . . . oluscula lardo*.<sup>13</sup> The whole array of homely *suppellex* which a satire enumerates<sup>14</sup> is in *Ode* II, 16, 13 f. represented by the *paternum salinum*. A passage like *Sat.* I, 6,

"Horace and the Doctrine of the Mean," has been treated by Whitney J. Oates in *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps* (Princeton, 1936), pp. 260 ff.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin, 1913), p. 313. More than any other Roman author Horace thinks of his life as having a characteristic "form" and pattern. When he describes himself as poet or as lover he is apt to think in terms of certain symbols and ideologies which by tradition belonged to these types of life, yet when he really speaks of himself—not as poet, lover, farmer, philosopher, but simply as Quintus Horatius Flaccus—he gives us no ideology nor a mere *vita*, *Lucili ritu* (cf. *Sat.*, II, 1, 32 ff.) but a *βίος*, i. e. the account of a life organized and consistently lived in agreement with certain basic valuations. Nothing is more characteristic of the extremely strong hold which Greek ways of thinking had acquired over his mind.

<sup>13</sup> *Sat.*, II, 3, 111 and 118; 6, 64. However, *ingentes acervi*—without *frumenti*—occurs at *Odes*, II, 2, 23 f. where these words are separated by a new coinage (*oculo inretorto*) *Graeco de fonte* (*ἀμετάστροφος*) which is meant to ennoble the diction, although J. Wight Duff, *A Literary History of Rome to the Close of the Golden Age*, p. 538, calls it a "lapse." The passage is clearly an echo of the *Satires*.

<sup>14</sup> *Sat.*, I, 6, 116 ff. Contrast also I, 6, 114 ff. There is no parallel in the *Satires* to the passage (*Odes*, III, 29, 33 ff.) *cetera fluminis ritu feruntur*, etc. In the *Epistles*, style, tone and *ῥθος* are again different. In *Epist.*, I, 1 the desire for gain is actually described as a trait of the Roman national character (cf. lines 42 ff. and especially lines 53 ff., 70 ff.; see also *Epist.*, II, 3, 323 ff.).

68 ff.: *si neque avaritiam neque sordis nec mala lustra obiciet vere quisquam mihi, purus et insons . . . si et vivo carus amicis* has its more august analogue in *Ode* III, 29, 54 ff.: *mea virtute me involvo probamque pauperiem sine dote quaero*. Some of the topics which had figured in the *Satires*, e.g. the *cura* of the wealthy miser or the *frumenti quantum metit Africa*<sup>15</sup> could with slight modifications be admitted into the *Odes*<sup>16</sup> but the modifications even if purely stylistic usually have the effect of investing the motif with greater dignity, of rendering the accents firmer and severer, and of transfiguring factual elements into symbols—for it is by symbolism more than by any other device that Horace succeeds in securing for his abstract subject matter something of the vividness and reality in which his models have excelled.<sup>17</sup> In the *Odes* “familiar” detail and features of day-to-day life are kept at a minimum; instead, Life is seen in its entirety and not infrequently against the background of Death, who in the *Satires* never appears but whose *Necessitas* may at any moment be conjured up in the *Odes*.

For our purpose, however, it is not sufficient to realize that the theme of Moderation and Contentment with Little was remoulded in accordance with the character of the *Odes*. We must go a step further. The circumstances of the time and the nature of the new genre which Horace had chosen might easily prompt him to give his subject a new turn and see it in relation to a new sphere, the Roman state, instead of always referring it to the question of private happiness. For a return to a simple style of life and the avoidance of extravagant luxury were ideas which had the backing of the *princeps*; they were in unison with the political currents and tendencies of the time, to some extent even with the official policy.<sup>18</sup> The ode, moreover, by its nature and

<sup>15</sup> See especially *Sat.*, I, 1, 70 ff. and 76 ff.; II, 3, 87.

<sup>16</sup> For *cura* see III, 1, 38 ff.; II, 16, 21 ff. (for the genuineness of the latter passage cf. Kurt Latte, *Philologus*, XC [1935], p. 298). As regards the other motif, *quidquid de Libycis verritur arcis* (*Odes*, I, 1, 10) comes to mind (see also III, 16, 26) but in the *Odes* large possessions are also characterized in sentences of this type: *si Mygdoniis regnum Alyattei campis continuem* (III, 16, 41); *si Libyam remotis Gadibus iungas*, etc. (II, 2, 10).

<sup>17</sup> Horace's erotic odes offer particularly interesting material for a study of his symbols and his peculiar artistic habits in employing them.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. e.g. F. E. Adcock in *C.A.H.*, X, p. 586; John Buchan, *Augustus* (Boston, 1937), pp. 98 f.

tradition, could well embody appeals and messages to the entire community. Following in the footsteps of Alcaeus, Horace had from the beginning used it as a vehicle for his hopes and fears regarding the prospects of the Roman commonwealth.<sup>19</sup> Thus, it is worth investigating how and to what extent Horace availed himself in the *Odes* of the possibility of bringing out the political significance of his favorite subject.

*Ode* III, 24, because of its closeness to the *Epodes* in style, temperament, and to some extent also in content, has been declared one of Horace's earlier odes.<sup>20</sup> Approaching the ode from our present point of view, we notice that it too denounces people's attachment to wealth, the insane luxury and the never satisfied desire to acquire more and more. We shall presently see that Horace has this time given the theme a turn towards the political sphere, yet this orientation is hardly noticeable at the beginning where he speaks of the mania for large buildings and of the type of men who not content with the land on which they might erect their houses trespass into the *mare publicum*.<sup>21</sup> Here we recognize—and are of course not the first to recognize<sup>22</sup>—the same topic as in III, 1. The habit of building into the sea had evidently struck Horace's imagination as a particularly drastic symptom of the prevailing luxury and moral degeneracy and with the characteristic tendency of the *Odes* to keep to symbols once coined and to give them new turns Horace employs this motif here as well as in III, 1—also as a matter of fact in II, 18.<sup>23</sup> In a later passage of III, 24 the *prævus cupidus* is

<sup>19</sup> It will suffice to mention I, 14 and I, 37. I, 2 is not considered quite so early. Cf. W. Y. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age. Horace and the Elegiacs* (Oxford, 1892), p. 151.

<sup>20</sup> See in particular Heinze's introduction to the poem in *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Erster Teil: Oden und Epoden erklärt von Adolf Kiessling und Richard Heinze* (7th ed., Berlin, 1930); also *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 222. Cf. also Warde Fowler, *op. cit.* (note 7), p. 227 and for a fruitful new approach (which confirms the early date of the poem) Karl Buchner, *Sitzb. Leipz. Akad.*, 1939, Heft 2, p. 38. Note also the reference to *rabies civica* at line 26.

<sup>21</sup> III, 24, 3. In line 4 I read like Heinze, Klingner, and other editors *terrenum* at the beginning and *publicum* at the end. It is almost certain that Porphyrio read *terrenum*, not *Tyrrhenum* in his text.

<sup>22</sup> Wickham and Heinze draw repeatedly on III, 1; II, 15; and II, 18 for parallels and explanations.

<sup>23</sup> III, 1, 33 ff.; II, 18, 20 ff.; Notice *caementa* at III, 1, 35 as well as



stigmatized as one of the basic political ills which should be eradicated—ruthlessly—if the citizenry is ever to recover its health. Luxuries are the *summi materies mali*; the minds of the Roman youth ought to be turned in a radically different direction.<sup>24</sup> *Quid leges sine moribus vanae proficiunt* if people continue to go to every length—in Horace's concrete language, to brave every danger—in their unbridled desire to gain more and more wealth. In this context, Horace refers to the voyages of the merchant to every part of the world and at every time of the year, however unseasonable.<sup>25</sup> This is another of those specific illustrations or "symbols" which he likes to work into this context; the merchant is in Horace's mind also in a passage of III, 1.<sup>26</sup> In III, 24 Horace actually calls for a man energetic enough to curb the *indomita licentia* (lines 25 ff.). It would of course have to be a political leader and there can be no doubt whom he had in mind. We should also notice his suggestion—just as specific and as utopian as certain suggestions in the *Epodes*<sup>27</sup>—that the citizens carry their *gemmas et lapides aurum et inutile* to the Capital *quo clamor vocat et turba faventium*.<sup>28</sup>

Thus, Horace has in this poem unquestionably brought out the relation between a moderate way of life—his favorite personal theme, we remember—and the desperate condition of the Roman commonwealth. Ethics shows us two different faces. On the one hand, it is a man's private concern, and this approach which was very common in the Hellenistic centuries was Horace's approach too. On the other hand, the thoughtful Roman of Augustus' time was aware of an intimate connection between ethics and politics. So had Cicero been,<sup>29</sup> to say nothing about the Greeks

24, 3. These parallels are recorded by F. Plessis, P. Lejay, and E. Galletier, *Les Oeuvres d'Horace* (Paris, 1924), *ad loc.* See also *Epist.*, I, 1, 83 ff.; Tibullus, II, 3, 45 f.

<sup>24</sup> Lines 51 ff., 45 ff.

<sup>25</sup> Lines 35 ff.

<sup>26</sup> III, 1, 25 ff.; cf. e.g. I, 1, 15 ff.; 31, 10 ff.; III, 29, 57 ff. The *mercator* as illustration of the insatiable desire for gain can be traced back to the *Satires* (especially I, 4, 29).

<sup>27</sup> Wickham compares *Epod.* 16, 17 ff. Cf. also Th. Zielinski, *Horace et la Société Romaine des Temps d'Auguste* (Paris, 1938), p. 99.

<sup>28</sup> Lines 45-50. The commentators point out that Augustus may by that time already have set an example for the carrying of *gemmae* and *aurum* to the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol (Suetonius, *Aug.* 30).

<sup>29</sup> See especially *De Re Publ.*, IV, V. Cicero sometimes brings the

of the classical period with whose ideas Horace was familiar. Sure enough, if a Roman author comes to discuss the ethical foundations of political life, it will not be long before he sighs for the good old days of Cincinnatus or Fabricius but in point of truth the heritage of Greek thought had had a much more determining influence in shaping the educated Roman's outlook in such matters than the idealized picture of old Roman simplicity; in fact, this picture itself owed its existence in no small measure to the teachings of Greek philosophers.<sup>30</sup>

It is, however, not enough if we recognize that in *Ode* III, 24 Horace has related the theme of Moderation and Contentment with Little to the fate of the Roman state. The state of sexual morality in Rome is likewise a matter for alarm and in need of reform. Here the primitive Scythians provide a contrast. The ideal condition of chastity which has so sadly vanished in Rome is present in their life.<sup>31</sup> The picture of Roman marital and sexual life which Horace shows us in III, 24—not directly but by implication and contrast—is bound to remind us of that drawn in another "Roman Ode," III, 6, which includes a fuller and more eloquent and straightforward description of contemporary Roman decadence in matters of sexual morality.<sup>32</sup> Evidently *licentia* in the sphere of sex and *cupido* in the sphere of material gain are the two cardinal ills from which Rome suffers. As Augustus sought to curb extravagance in private building as well as the decline of family life,<sup>33</sup> so Horace in *Ode* III, 24

interests of the Roman state to bear on the question whether preference should be given to Epicureanism or to Stoicism; see e. g. *De Fin.*, II, 60 ff.; 76; *Ad Fam.*, VII, 12; *Pro Sest.* 23.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. R. M. Henry, "The Roman Tradition" in *Proc. Class. Ass.* (London, 1937), pp. 7-28. Henry suggests that the so-called Roman Tradition came into existence at about the middle of the second century and that it was shaped by Middle Stoicism. I cannot subscribe to his extreme views. A study of Ennius is perhaps the most effective antidote to the idea that the Roman Tradition is wholly the product of Greek philosophy. But to some extent it certainly is and if the necessary qualifications are made Henry's theory should prove helpful and stimulating.

<sup>31</sup> Lines 17-24. Horace uses the *τόπος* of the Scythians to show that chastity is practised where wealth is unknown.

<sup>32</sup> III, 6, 17-32.

<sup>33</sup> See especially Suetonius, *Aug.* 89. On the subject of legislation cf. A. D. Winspear and L. K. Geweke, *Augustus and the Reconstruction of*

castigates these two alarming trends and indicates how Rome may be cured of the diseases which are undermining the nation's life and health.

It seems clear then, that *Ode* III, 24 may help us considerably towards understanding the growth and gradual maturing of important ideas that were to be embodied in the "Roman Odes."<sup>34</sup> Being still relatively close to the impressions of the civil war and reflecting, like some epodes and a few other odes, the poet's awareness of *scelera*, *vitium*, *culpa*<sup>35</sup>—it yet points forward to a more constructive approach and includes a demand, if not a program, of reform. We seem to be half-way between some of the epodes in which the consciousness of a curse was uppermost in the poet's mind and the "Roman Odes" which embody his response to a new and better order of things. In III, 24 two lines of social criticism—the one aimed at excessive greed and luxury, and the other directed against sexual demoralization—emerge and take shape against the background of the civil war and its *scelera*. The two lines which have their point of origin in common will later branch out and separate; in "Roman Odes" 1 and 6 the original connection between the themes of social criticism is severed, with the result that each of them is now set forth in a separate poem. If Horace had suppressed III, 24 we should not know that they were to his mind complementary themes.

A few, though perhaps minor, items in this poem should still be noted since they have a bearing upon our problem. *Necessitas* with her *clavi* appears also in the ode on Fortuna (I, 35, 18) but only in III, 24 and III, 1 does *Necessitas* represent the necessity

*Roman Government and Society* (Univ. of Wisc. Stud. in Soc. Sc. and Hist., XXIV [1935]), pp. 172 ff.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Warde Fowler, *op. cit.* (note 7), p. 227, who credits Wickham with the suggestion that *Odes*, III, 24 "supplied some at least of the subjects of these first six odes" (of Book III). So far as I can see Wickham never said exactly this but the suggestion, whether Wickham's or not, seems indeed correct although I prefer to think not in terms of "subjects supplied" by one ode to others but rather of a development—a fashioning and refashioning—of poetic conceptions and symbols.

<sup>35</sup> See especially lines 25 ff.; 33 ff. (34 *culpa*); 45 ff. (50 *scelera*); cf. *Epodes* 7 and 16; *Odes*, I, 2 (line 23 *vitium*, 29 *scelus*, 47 *vitia*); I, 35 (lines 33 ff.); III, 6. On the curse motif cf. Wilkinson, *op. cit.* (note 10), p. 66.

of death.<sup>36</sup> In III, 24 even the highest are unable to escape her decision; in III, 1 the high and the low are equally subject to her *lex* (lines 13 ff.). This equality characterizes the coming of Death in several other odes: *aequo pede*, I, 4, 13; *aequa tellus*, II, 18, 32. Yet the *Necessitas* of III, 24 holds a twofold threat for the extravagant spendthrift; if she does not bring death she brings fear (*metus*) from which he can no more "extricate his heart."<sup>37</sup> As in III, 1 (lines 32-40), this fear grips the man whose buildings cover "land as well as the public sea."

We may deal more briefly with two other poems which castigate manifestations of contemporary Roman luxury. The ode II, 15 (*iam pauca aratro iugera regiae moles relinquent*) takes in its second part a definite turn towards the political sphere, pointing out how different the relation between private and public expenditure was in the good old days of Romulus and Cato;<sup>38</sup> the energetic *Non ita* with which this section begins offers a stylistic parallel to the equally abrupt and emphatic *Non his iuventas orta parentibus* with which Horace in the sixth "Roman Ode" turns from contemporary demoralization to the stern morality of earlier generations.<sup>39</sup> Ode II, 18 has already been mentioned<sup>40</sup> as embodying a reference to the habit of extending palatial mansions into the lakes; it also includes—like III, 1—a contrast between Horace's happy life on his Sabine farm and the luxurious buildings which are fashionable with the wealthy.<sup>41</sup> If we ask whether this poem too views contemporary luxury from the social or political aspect the following passage (lines 23 ff.) would seem to be crucial:

<sup>36</sup> At I, 3, 32 Horace specifies the *Necessitas* by adding the genitive *leti*. The commentators are justified in complaining about the obscurity of III, 24, 5 f.; however a *summus vertex* is probably the same as a *late conspicuus vertex* (III, 16, 19) and from the conception of *Necessitas* as carrying *clavi* in her hand it is hardly a far cry to her driving them home. On this interpretation *summis verticibus* may be construed as a dative of reference rather than as an ablative.

<sup>37</sup> III, 24, 7 ff.

<sup>38</sup> Lines 10 ff.

<sup>39</sup> II, 15, 10; III, 6, 33.

<sup>40</sup> See above, p. 343. The arguments for an early date of II, 18 are well summarized by Heinze in his Introduction to the ode (*op. cit.* [see note 20], p. 249).

<sup>41</sup> II, 18, 1-14 (lines 5-9 present some other illustrations of wealth and high position); III, 1, 45-48.

Quid quod usque proximos  
 revellis agri terminos et ultra  
 limites clientium  
 salis avarus? Pellitur paternos  
 in sinu ferens deos  
 et uxor et vir sordidosque natos.

One can easily imagine that the wretched people thus deprived of their small holdings would swell the numbers of the destitute proletariat in the city and it is tempting to think that at the time of a movement "back-to-the-country"—in ideology at least, if not in fact—such acts as Horace here pillories would be considered not only as anti-social but even as downright unpatriotic.<sup>42</sup> However, all this is "interpretation"; Horace himself does not stigmatize the rich man's actions as a crime against the nation but emphasizes the absurdity of indulging in such acts of *avaritia* while one may be at the threshold of death (*sub ipsum funus*).<sup>43</sup>

We return now to III, 1, bringing back as the result of our excursion into other poems the realization that it was definitely within the range of Horace's poetic imagination and capacity to describe greed and luxury as a blight on the political life of the nation and as running counter to the best traditions of Roman history.<sup>44</sup> What is more, he could use the very motifs and the poetical material that have gone into the making of III, 1 to drive home his political message. It is of course all the more remarkable that in III, 1 Horace never touches on the political aspects or implications of his theme. Did he feel that his mes-

<sup>42</sup> Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926), p. 65. Rostovtzeff would evidently favor the "political" interpretation of the passage under discussion: "To judge by many poems of Horace which echoed no doubt the talk at the table of Maecenas and Augustus, the subject of the disappearance of the peasants was a common topic of discussion. . . . Public opinion voiced by patriotic and loyal Romans appealed to Augustus to save the peasants." Cf. also Winspear and Geweke, *op. cit.* (see note 33), p. 20.

<sup>43</sup> These words at the beginning of our passage (line 18) form a brief prelude to the much fuller and more elaborate treatment of the *rapax Orcus* which we read after the description of the excesses committed by the rich man (lines 29 ff.). The connection between lines 29 ff. and what precedes them is very close; cf. Heinze, *ad loc.*, who nevertheless insists on setting off 29-40 as a separate part of the poem.

<sup>44</sup> For a further reference to the *paupertas* of the old days see *Odes*, I, 12, 41-44. See also *Sat.*, II, 7, 23.



sage would be more impressive if the poem as such lacked explicit references to the political problems of Rome? Perhaps, in fact probably he did so. Yet, it should be possible to formulate a somewhat more specific answer to our question.

If it is true that the six *carmina non prius audita* were conceived and meant to be accepted as a unit it stands to reason that what we miss in the content of *Ode III, 1* is largely made up by its place as one of these *carmina*. The reference to Rome's salvation which our poem lacks is amply supplied by those which follow.<sup>45</sup> True, what particular salutary effect contentment with little would have on Rome's political condition remains unsaid but it could indeed remain so. In *III, 24* Horace gives vigorous expression to his belief that the unrestrained desire for riches and sexual immorality are a cancer on the Roman body politic. In the "Roman Odes" he makes this point only in connection with the latter subject, in *III, 6*, but the conclusion of *III, 6* is at the same time the conclusion of this whole set of poems and if we know that the old Romans were very different from the contemporaries whose excesses Horace denounces in *III, 6* we know also that they were different from the people whose type of life he repudiates in *III, 1*. Thus it becomes unnecessary to make this contrast as explicit as it is made in *II, 15*.

We have seen that the first stanza of *III, 1* fixes its place at the head of the series but there are also other and more specific links between the individual poems of this series which should not go unnoticed. If *III, 1* lacks references to the political order it does not ignore the divine order and the gods. *Regum timendorum in proprios greges, reges in ipsos imperium est Jovis* is a suitable beginning for a *Musarum sacerdos*. Other "Roman

<sup>45</sup> Cf. *III, 2, 1 ff.*; *III, 3 passim*, especially 49 ff., 57 ff.; *III, 5, 13 ff.*; *III, 6, 1 ff.* It might be argued that the second "Roman Ode" which begins *Angustam amice pauperiem pati* takes up the theme of the first and develops it in a manner which shows the military and political value of *paupertas*. To me *pauperies* seems a stronger word than the moderation—the *desiderare quod satis est*—which Horace recommends in *III, 1*. To be sure at *II, 18, 10* he calls himself *pauper* but the *pauperies* of *III, 29, 56* is somewhat hypothetical. Cf. also *III, 16, 37. IV, 9, 46 ff.* is unique. On the whole I should say that the relation between the two poems is best expressed in the words which Horace uses at *III, 24, 51-54*. It is difficult to agree with Pasquali's views (*op. cit.* [see above, note 5], pp. 651 f.) on this subject; the first ode is less "Epicurean" than he thinks, the second Roman rather than "Stoic" in its outlook.

Odes" too give us intimations of the world order, of the *imperium Jovis*, of the divine *lex*, and of the *Giganteus triumphus*; in fact this *triumphus* of which in our ode we find merely a brief but emphatic mention is celebrated at great length in III, 4.<sup>46</sup> Horace is clearly anxious to bring out links and correspondences between the right political order in Rome and the divine order of the Universe.<sup>47</sup> He has related the theme of III, 1 to the divine world government which in turn forms the background to his idealized picture of the Roman state.

Although we have already touched on the style of the ode III, 1 it must be emphasized once more that among the poems recommending Moderation III, 1 is unique owing to its severe dignity and a certain stern remoteness. This remoteness gives it something impersonal; actually there are no forms of the second person and apart from the very first and the very last stanzas in which they have special justification and produce special effects no forms of the first person either.<sup>48</sup> Moreover, while the first and second stanzas contain each a complete and rounded off thought, everywhere else a thought fills exactly two stanzas. To be sure within these units of two stanzas there is *variatio* in the relation between sentence and stanza,<sup>49</sup> yet the five times repeated

<sup>46</sup> III, 2, 29 ff.; 3, 17 ff. (*Fata* and *lex*: lines 57, 58); 4, 42 ff. (defeat of the Giants); 5, 1 ff.; 6, 1 ff., 5 ff.

<sup>47</sup> See also III, 4, 65 with the emphatic distinction between *vis consilii expers* and *vis temperata*. It seems to be Horace's idea that *consilium* which triumphed over the Giants is also thanks to the Muses vouchsafed to human individuals (see lines 37-42) like Augustus and that consequently Rome too is ruled by *consilium* and *vis temperata*. Rutilius Namatianus says of Rome *Nec tibi nascenti plures animaeque manusque / Sed plus consilii iudiciiue fuit* (*De Red. Suo*, 87 f.). In general cf. Theiler, *op. cit.* (see above, note 7), especially pp. 264 ff. and 273 (the *consilium* motif), 268 (Hellenistic background to the parallel between the earthly ruler and the *regnum* of Jupiter; for this Hellenistic tradition see E. R. Goodenough, *Yale Classical Studies*, I [1928], pp. 55 ff.).

<sup>48</sup> II, 18 and III, 24 which we have compared with III, 1 make use of the second person even though they lack addressees.

<sup>49</sup> At lines 21 and 37 a new sentence begins in the second of the two stanzas after the caesura of the first line; at lines 13 and 34 the first sentence continues into the second line of the second stanza; at line 46 its end coincides with the end of this line. At lines 25-32 one sentence, in no way broken, fills the two stanzas. It clearly also makes a good deal of difference whether a sentence continues into the next stanza by "enjambement" (21, 37), by anaphora (if this term can be applied to

scheme of bringing an idea to its conclusion within the compass of exactly two stanzas gives the structure of the ode a certain rigidity which adds to its solemn and lofty quality. This solemnity is reinforced by a remarkable brevity of expression; not only has Horace denied himself excursions and does not linger over any specific picture or illustrative symbol but he enumerates repeatedly in quick succession various alternative instances of a particular condition of affairs<sup>50</sup> giving each of them little space and usually compressing the last illustration into fewer words or syllables than the preceding.<sup>51</sup> The piling up of such illustrations conveys an impression of finality precluding as it were further argument about the matter. *Parum locuples continente ripa* (II, 18, 22) says much in little but *dominusque terrae fastidiosus* goes it one better. Words of five syllables (and corresponding weight) like *elaborabunt*, *desiderantem*, *tumultuosum*, *fastidiosus*, *Achaemeniumque*, fill a good part of their respective lines<sup>52</sup> and a remarkable proportion of lines—especially third and fourth lines—are made up of only three words,<sup>53</sup> a technique which is especially noticeable at the beginning, while at the end of the whole poem we have a line made up of only two.<sup>54</sup> We could comment on many other features if

line 29), or in the fashion for which lines 41-48 provide a good example; here the conditional clause fills one stanza, the apodosis the next. Such matters have been studied by Karl Buchner, *op. cit.* (see note 20).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. lines 9 ff., 18 ff., 22 ff., 25 ff., 30 ff., 38 ff., 41 ff. There is again a high degree of *variatio* in the structure and the wording of these enumerations.

<sup>51</sup> At lines 22-24 the second *non* clause is shorter; so is the second alternative in lines 27 f., the third *nunc* clause at 32 in comparison with the second, and the second *cur* clause in the last stanza. Again the clause (12 f.) beginning with *illi* has fewer syllables than the immediately preceding *hic* clause and line 15 fewer than 13 f. which expresses the same thought.

<sup>52</sup> Lines 19, 25, 26, 37.

<sup>53</sup> I count nine lines of three or two words in the twelve stanzas, whereas III, 29 has seven such lines in sixteen Alcaic stanzas. However, a glance at I, 9 and I, 27 will teach that this criterion of grandeur and *δευόρτης* can be used effectively only if the results are checked and interpreted in the light of other considerations.

<sup>54</sup> *Divitias operosiores* (line 48). Cf. *progeniem vitiosiore* at the end of the last "Roman Ode" (6, 48). Of 37 poems in which Horace uses the Alcaic strophe III, 1 and III, 6 are the only two that finish on a line of two words. In fact no other line of the kind is found in Horace's Alcaics.

there were space to go through the poem section by section. Notice for instance how the enumeration of various claims to distinction in the third and fourth stanzas moves on with a certain air of triumph and firmness for more than five lines until it is checked by a much briefer but in its brevity inexorable statement of Necessity's eternal law before which this imposing procession of human pride comes to a halt and is left disarmed and impotent.<sup>55</sup> There is no warmth or intimacy in this ode. Horace is this time not speaking as friend. He speaks as authority and the authoritative tone indicates that more is involved than the right approach to matters that are of purely personal concern.

All these considerations help us to understand how a poem like *Ode* III, 1 may have a political bearing even though this bearing has not been made explicit. Every student of Horace may judge for himself whether this poem which by its place and tone is raised above the level of a private exhortation is more felicitous or III, 24 with its frank denunciation of greed and immorality as the prime political ills and its almost clamorous demand for a savior and *pater patriae*. By contrast to III, 24 and II, 15 our ode, which keeps aloof not only from the contemporary and ephemeral but also from the national and historical and *spernit humum fugiente penna*, states what it has to state in the form of eternal verities. Yet these verities are the same as had always been Horace's personal and most intimate preoccupation.

However difficult it may be to relate the subject of III, 3 or III, 5—perhaps also of III, 2—to his individuality the poem that opens the cycle of political odes and sets the tone for the whole group proclaims in effect that the moral recovery of Rome is predicated on the same approach to life through which the poet has found his own individual happiness and which he has so frequently expounded in relation to his private existence. The universality which Horace has given his theme is not impaired by references to political actualities and yet the ode is (as we have seen) an organic and essential part of his grand message to the nation.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

<sup>55</sup> III, 1, 13-15.

## SYRIA AND CILICIA.

A Greek inscription from Naples records the distinctions of a famous athlete, T. Flavius Artemidorus, victor in the pan-cratiun at the first Capitoline games in A. D. 86.<sup>1</sup> Among other prizes, Artemidorus was twice victorious at the "common games of Syria Phoenicia Cilicia in Antioch."<sup>2</sup> This statement poses a problem the solution of which will be of interest not only to historians of the Roman Empire but, as we shall see, to students of Scripture as well.

"Common games" (κοινὸι ἀγῶνες) were organized by a Greek "commonwealth" (κοινόν). These federations were mostly traditional ethnic or religious groupings which gave special homage to a sanctuary or a festival.<sup>3</sup> Such was, for instance, the "Koinon of the Hellenes," which down to the second century A. D. continued to celebrate the Eleutheria instituted at Plataea after the victory over the Persians.<sup>4</sup> The other type of the *koinon* was a confederation of the Greek cities in a Roman province, formed (or reorganized) by Augustus and his successors, to secure the loyalty of the subjects to the emperor. Such a *koinon* also had some political functions as the representative body of the province; its primary responsibility, however, was the maintenance of the provincial cult of the emperor and of festivals and games in his honor. Since Cilicia never really constituted one with Syria, except as a temporary expedient of the administration,<sup>5</sup> the victory of Artemidorus in the "common

<sup>1</sup> *I.G.*, XIV, 746 = *I. G. R.*, I, 445. Artemidorus is mentioned by Martial, VI, 77: *cum sis . . . tam fortis quam nec cum vinceret Artemidorus*. But I am not convinced by L. Friedlaender's argument *ad loc.* that Martial's epigram implies the loss of his championship by Artemidorus.

<sup>2</sup> *νεικήσας . . . κοινὸν Συρίας Κιλικίας Φοινείκης ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ β' ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιον.*

<sup>3</sup> See now J. A. O. Larsen, *C. P.*, XL (1945), p. 65.

<sup>4</sup> L. Robert, *R. E. A.*, 1929, p. 16.

<sup>5</sup> For instance, under Alexander the Great there was an intendant of Syria and Phoenicia and Cilicia (Arrian, II, 16, 9). Q. Sosius governed Syria and Cilicia in 38-36 B. C. (Dio Cassius, XLIX, 22, 3), and both countries were probably united under Caesar and Antonius. See R. Syme in *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler* (1939), p. 329,



games of Syria Phoenicia Cilicia in Antioch" shows that at some time between Augustus and Domitian the imperial government attached Cilicia to the province of Syria.

Five literary data confirm this inference. Tacitus records that in A. D. 35, Artabanus, king of Parthia, claimed the treasure left by Vonones, a Parthian exile, in *Syria Ciliciaque*.<sup>6</sup> A year before he was murdered, Vonones had been removed by Germanicus to Soli, in Cilicia (A. D. 18).<sup>7</sup> Tacitus' statement shows that in 35 this city belonged to the province Syria-Cilicia. Writing in the reign of Claudius, Columella says that he has seen the sesame sown in June and July *Ciliciae Syriaeque regionibus*.<sup>8</sup> He served in Syria about A. D. 36. In Galatians, Paul the Apostle says that after his first visit to Jerusalem he went "to the regions of Syria and Cilicia."<sup>9</sup> Since he sailed from Caesarea to Tarsus,<sup>10</sup> his wording suggests that at this time (about A. D. 35-40) Cilicia was joined with Syria. Some years later, about A. D. 50, the Christian community in Jerusalem sent a message to the brethren "in Antioch and Syria and

and note the usage of *Bell. Alex.*, 1, 1; 25, 1; 26, 1: *Syria Ciliciaque*. Cf. Sallust, *Or. Cottae*, 7: *exercitus in Asia Ciliciaque ob nimias opes Mithridatis aluntur*. The passage refers to Lucullus' joint governorship of Asia and Cilicia in 74 B. C.

<sup>6</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.*, VI, 31: *missis qui gazam a Vonone relictam in Syria Ciliciaque reposcerent*.

<sup>7</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.*, II, 58 and 68. Cf. Suetonius, *Tib.*, 49.

<sup>8</sup> Columella, II, 10, 18: *sed hoc idem semen Ciliciae Syriaeque regionibus vidi mense Iunio Iulioque conseri*. Cf. on the other hand Columella, XI, 2, 56: *quibusdam regionibus sicut in Cilicia et Pamphilia*. The word *regio* had no administrative significance but meant "country." Cf. T. R. S. Broughton, in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake* (1937), p. 134.

<sup>9</sup> Gal. 1, 21: *τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ Κιλικίας* according to the reading of Codex Sinaiticus. The other uncials place a second article before the word *Κιλικίας*. Cf. W. M. Ramsay, *Histor. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (1902), p. 277. Cf. Act. Ap. 15, 41: *Paul διήρχετο δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν* and 27, 5: *τό τε πέρατος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κιλικίαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν*. This sea belongs to both countries together. Cf. Mela, II, 102: the gulf *inter Ciliciam Syriasque porrigitur*. On the other hand, the provinces of Macedonia and Achaëa, although adjacent, are distinguished in the New Testament (Rom. 15, 26; II Cor. 9, 2). They are spoken of together in Act. Ap. 19, 21 since Paul going to Jerusalem passes "through Macedonia and Achaëa."

<sup>10</sup> Act. Ap. 9, 30.

Cilicia."<sup>11</sup> This address implies that Antioch, the capital of Syria, was at this time also that of Cilicia. In the so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees, the Seleucid strategos of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia is styled strategos of "Syria Phoenicia and Cilicia."<sup>12</sup> This formulation is exactly the same as the one in the inscription at Naples.<sup>13</sup>

The literary evidence cited, as far as a date can be established, refers to the end of the reign of Tiberius and to that of Claudius. This contrasts with the view generally held<sup>14</sup> that Cilicia was united with the province of Syria between the reign of Augustus and Vespasian. This view is based on two misunderstandings.

Augustus entrusted native rulers with the government of the so-called Cilicia Aspera, that is of the region of rugged mountains in the interior and western part of Cilicia, inhabited by barbarian tribes. This territory, which also included some cities, e.g. Elaeussa or Anemurium on the coast, remained outside of the Roman provincial government until A. D. 72 when it was annexed by Vespasian.<sup>15</sup> The rich plain of coastal Cilicia was organized, on the other hand, as a group of city states, which already in the reign of Augustus formed a "koinon of Cilicia," headed by Tarsus.<sup>16</sup> Only this Cilician *koinon* could have been included in the province of Syria before A. D. 72.

<sup>11</sup> Act. Ap. 15, 23: τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιοχείαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς.

<sup>12</sup> IV Macc. 4, 2: ἦκων πρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον τὸν Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης καὶ Κιλικίας στρατηγόν.

<sup>13</sup> The official Roman name of the province was "Syria," but in usage the name was often expanded to indicate the countries included in the province. Thus, the latter is sometimes styled "Syria and Phoenicia" or, under Trajan, "Syria Phoenicia Commagene." Cf. my paper "La Coelé-Syrie" in *Rev. Bibl.*, 1947, p. 256. For example, A. Iulius Quadratus is styled governor of "Syria" or of "Syria, Phoenicia, Commagene" or of "Syria, Phoenicia, Commagene, Tyrus." See now A. v. Premerstein, *Sitzb. Bayer. Akad.*, 1934, no. 3, p. 63.

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., J. G. C. Anderson, *C. A. H.*, X, p. 279 and J. Keil, *ibid.*, XI, p. 602.

<sup>15</sup> See now A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937), p. 203; R. Syme in *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler* (1939), p. 325.

<sup>16</sup> See *B. M. C. Lycania* (1900), p. xci. Mionnet, *Supplem.*, VII, p. 407. Tarsus is styled *metropolis* on its coins struck under Augustus and Tiberius: Mionnet, *Description*, III, p. 624; E. Babelon, *Inventaire de la Collect. Waddington* (1897), no. 4622. Cf. Strabo, XIV, 674.

The hypothesis which put the union of Cilicia with Syria under Augustus was suggested by Baronius in his *Annales Ecclesiastici* (1588)<sup>17</sup> and advanced again by Mommsen in 1850.<sup>18</sup> The authority of the latter determined the view of later historians. Both great scholars had recourse to this hypothesis to explain the career of P. Sulpicius Quirinius, whose "prior" Syrian governorship is mentioned in the Gospel of Luke (2, 1) and to whose expedition *per Ciliciam* against the Homonades<sup>19</sup> Tacitus refers. We need not enter into debate about Quirinius.<sup>20</sup> As a matter of fact, his action against the Homonades as well as all other cases of military intervention by the Syrian governors in Cilicia (recorded A. D. 19 and 36 and 52)<sup>21</sup> took place in the client states of Cilicia Aspera and, consequently, have no bearing on our subject.<sup>22</sup> As to Cilicia Campestris, its administrative status under Augustus is nowhere indicated.<sup>23</sup> But Strabo and

<sup>17</sup> Baronius' suggestion was opposed by Is. Casaubon, *De Rebus Sacris* (ed. 1655), p. 125.

<sup>18</sup> See Th. Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (2nd ed., 1883), p. 173.

<sup>19</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.*, III, 48; H. Dessau, *I. L. S.*, 918.

<sup>20</sup> See now Lily R. Taylor, *A. J. P.*, LIV (1933), p. 120; R. Syme, *Klio*, 1934, p. 134; J. G. C. Anderson, *C. A. H.*, X, p. 877; A. G. Roos, *Mnemos.*, 1941, p. 306; S. Accami, *Riv. di Fil.*, 1944-5, p. 138.

<sup>21</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.*, II, 78 and 80; VI, 41; XII, 55.

<sup>22</sup> For the same reason we do not need to comment on the inscription of Hierapolis-Castabala honoring L. Calpurnius Piso, consul B. C. 15, as "legatus and propraetor" (*Ann. Epigr.*, 1920, 71). Cf. Syme, *loc. cit.*, p. 127, and E. Groag and A. Stein, *Prosop. Imper. Romani* (2nd ed.), II, p. 63.

<sup>23</sup> Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.*, I, 11-12 is of no help. The Roman governor who held a conventus in Tarsus A. D. 17 may have been a deputy of the legatus of Syria. A coin of Aegeae under Tiberius is inscribed: *ἐπὶ Κουλεῶνος. Δημαν*. The name is regarded as that of a legate, Q. Terentius Culleo, who was cos. suff. in 40 A. D. Since there is no place for Culleo in the list of legati of Syria, the coin seems to offer additional evidence for the view that Cilicia was not united with Syria. But Culleo may have been a deputy of the nominal governor, L. Aelius Laemia, who was retained at Rome by Tiberius. Cf. Imhoof-Blumer, *Kleinasiat. Münzen*, II (1902), p. 427. S. J. de Laet, *De Samenstelling van den Romeinschen Senaat gedurende de eerste eeuw van het Principaat* (1941), p. 244, lists a governor of Cilicia under Claudius on the authority of the obsolete restitution of an inscription from Olympia (*Eph. Epigr.*, IV, p. 80). But, p. 48, he quotes the same inscription, according to a new edition (*C. I. L.*, III, 12278) as referring to A. Didius Gallus, governor of Moesia.

Pliny's lists of Cilician cities, drawn up under Augustus,<sup>24</sup> as well as the existence of the Cilician *koinon* with Tarsus as *metropolis*,<sup>25</sup> seem to imply that Cilicia was still distinct from Syria in the beginning of the empire. In any case, Tacitus shows that it was not incorporated into Syria in A. D. 18. At this date the king of Parthia protested against the stay of the above mentioned Vonones in Antioch. Germanicus removed him to Soli, *civitatem Ciliciae . . . ne Vonones in Syria haberetur*. Tacitus adds that the transfer was meant as an affront to Piso, governor of Syria.<sup>26</sup> Thus, Soli, and, consequently, Cilicia, were outside of the jurisdiction of the governor of Syria. Accordingly, A. D. 18 is the *terminus post quem* for the formation of the double province. The *terminus ante quem* is, as we have seen, A. D. 35. I am unable to narrow the margin between these two limits.

The assumption that Cilicia remained a part of Syria until A. D. 72 is based on another misunderstanding. In 72 Vespasian put Cilicia Aspera under provincial control<sup>27</sup> and, joining the new territory with Cilicia Campestris (Pedias), formed a separate province of Cilicia.<sup>28</sup> But this reorganization does not

<sup>24</sup> Pliny, *N. H.*, V, 90. Cf. A. Klotz, *Klio*, 1931, p. 429; Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 496.

<sup>25</sup> *Supra*, n. 16.

<sup>26</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.*, II, 58: *petere interim ne Vonones in Syria haberetur . . . Vonones Pompeiopolim Ciliciae maritimam urbem amotus est. Datum id non modo precibus Artabani sed contumeliae Pisonis*. The passage is explained by Lily R. Taylor, *loc. cit.*, p. 125.

<sup>27</sup> Suetonius, *Vesp.*, 8; Josephus, *B. J.*, VII, 243, gives the date of the annexation as the fourth year of Vespasian (July 1, 72-73). The era of Commagene, from 72, places the reorganization in 72. Jerome's date, 73-74, is faulty. G. A. Harrer (*Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria* [Diss., Princeton, 1915], p. 75), put the formation of the province Cilicia after 72, while in 72 Paetus, the governor of Syria, arrested at Tarsus the deposed king Antiochus of Commagene (Josephus, *B. J.*, VII, 238). But Paetus was commander-in-chief of the theatre of war and as such had the authority for intervention in an independent province. See Th. Mommsen, *Roemisches Staatsrecht* (3d ed.), II, 1, p. 256.

<sup>28</sup> The *provincia Cilicia* is expressly mentioned for the first time in the cursus of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (H. Dessau, *I. L. S.*, 8971), who governed the province ca. 90 A. D. See G. A. Harrer, *op. cit.*, p. 74 and E. Groag, *R.-E.*, X, col. 547. The next governor was Q. Gellius Longinus (A. D. 92-3; *Ann. Épigr.*, 1920, 72), about 98 M. Pompeius

warrant the assumption that Campestris had hitherto belonged to Syria and not, for example, to Cappadocia. In fact, two texts show that Cilicia had already been separated from Syria under Nero. First, there is a Latin inscription of a procurator of Nero *provinciae Cappadociae et Ciliciae*.<sup>29</sup> Since an imperial procurator could supervise several provinces, the inscription does not point to the incorporation of Cilicia with Cappadocia. But since there was also an imperial procurator of Syria, the record is sufficient to prove that at this date Cilicia was no more a unit with Syria.<sup>30</sup> Secondly, a passage in Tacitus places the separation before 55.<sup>31</sup> In the spring of this year, Q. Ummidius Quadratus, the legatus of Syria, was ordered to hand over two of his legions to Corbulo, charged with a command in Armenia. Fearing a loss of prestige if the transfer were made in Syria, Quadratus met Corbulo at Aegae, in Cilicia, lest Corbulo, should he enter Syria, draw attention to himself.<sup>32</sup> To conduct the Armenian

Macrinus governed Cilicia (*Ann. Épigr.*, 1913, 168). But as Harrer, p. 74, has pointed out, an inscription of 77-78, from Seleucia on the Calycadnus, refers to L. Octavius Memor, legate and propraetor, designated consul (*I. G. R.*, III, 840; now *M. A. M. A.*, III, p. 6). Since Seleucia politically belonged to Cilicia Campestris (as is shown by Strabo, XIV, 670 and the absence of the royal coinage), Memor's province doubtless included Cilicia Campestris. But Memor could not be a governor of Syria or of Cappadocia or of Pamphylia because these three legati in 77 are already known. They were, respectively, M. Ulpian Trajanus, the father of the future Emperor (see now H. Seyrig, *Syria*, 1941, p. 174), M. Neratius Pansa (*E. Groag, R.-E.*, XVI, col. 2546), and S. Marcius Priscus (*Fluss, R.-E.*, XIV, col. 1580). Thus, Memor could have been a governor only of Cilicia.

<sup>29</sup> Calder, *J. R. S.*, II (1912), p. 99 = *Ann. Épigr.*, 1914, 128: *proc. Nero[nis Cl]audi Ca[esaris] Aug(usti) Germa[nici pro]vinciae [Cappadociae et Ciliciae]*.

<sup>30</sup> As a separate province Cilicia had its own procurator. See *Ann. Épigr.*, 1924, 83; H. Dessau, *I. L. S.*, 9013. Note that in 102 Postumius Acilianus (*I. G. R.*, III, 928) was procurator of Syria and not of Cilicia. See *Ann. Épigr.*, 1939, 178.

<sup>31</sup> I do not make use of the trial of Cossutianus Capito, accused by the Cilicians in 57 (Tacitus, *Ann.*, XIII, 33), since Capito may have been a legatus of the governor of Syria.

<sup>32</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.*, XIII, 8: Corbulo *apud Aegeas civitatem Ciliciae obvium Quadratum habuit, illuc progressum, ne, si ad accipiendas copias Syriam intravisset Corbulo, omnium ora in se verteret*. The importance of this passage for our problem has been stressed by W. E. Gwatkin,



war, Corbulo received the command in Cappadocia and Galatia. But the most important land roads from the Aegean to Cappadocia ran from Cilician ports.<sup>33</sup> Thus, the suggestion may be made that Cilicia, too, was placed under his authority as a base of military operations, at the end of A. D. 54.

It would follow from these data that Cilicia Campestris was added to Syria sometime between A. D. 18 and 35 and separated from the latter before the spring of 55, probably at the end of 54. This chronological result gives us the date of composition of Fourth Maccabees.<sup>34</sup> This book, assigned on general grounds to almost every generation from that of Pompey to that of Trajan, was written, as the mention of the government of Syria Phoenicia and Cilicia shows, under Tiberius or Claudius. The same chronological conclusion may be drawn with regard to the so-called "Apostolic Decree," that is, the already quoted letter of the Christian leaders in Jerusalem to the brethren "in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia."

The authenticity of this record is often challenged. Critics observe that the Acts imply the general validity of the decree, and the local address of the letter does not seem to fit with the universality of the message, which was delivered for observance, for example, in the cities of Lycaonia as well.<sup>35</sup> For this reason the so-called "Western" text of the Acts already interpolates Act. Ap. 15, 41. Some modern exegetes are astonished that the superscription of the letter does not mention Derba or Lystra,<sup>36</sup> where the apostolic commandments were delivered by Paul and Timothy. Radical critics blame the phantastic geography of the sacred writer.<sup>37</sup> As a matter of fact these critics are not well versed in the practice of ancient chancelleries. When the latter had to forward the same text to several addressees, they

*Cappadocia as Roman Province* (University of Missouri Studies, V, No. 4 [1930]), p. 51.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. T. R. S. Broughton, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV, p. 861; R. Syme (*loc. cit.*, *supra*, n. 5), p. 303.

<sup>34</sup> See my paper "The Date of Fourth Maccabees" in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (1945), p. 105.

<sup>35</sup> Act. Ap. 16, 4; 21, 25. See, e. g., J. R. Porter, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, 1946, p. 169.

<sup>36</sup> See, e. g., E. Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (1926), *ad loc.*

<sup>37</sup> See, e. g., A. Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (1921), p. 598. Cf. H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (1941), p. 191.

often simply added the appropriate heading to each identical copy of the message.<sup>38</sup> Thus, in the case of the apostolic letter, there was an exemplar addressed to Lystra, another for Cyprus, and so on. One duplicate was addressed to the brethren "in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia." The fact that the author of the Acts quotes this heading proves only that he had at his disposition a copy of the exemplar forwarded to Antioch.

On the other hand, the authenticity of the letter is often doubted on general grounds of content and by reason of the disagreement between the document and the narrative in Galatians. I do not feel competent to enter into a debate on this point. But I must emphasize the fact that the superscription of the letter places its composition before A. D. 55. A later forger would hardly have knowledge of the temporary union between Syria and Cilicia and would in any case have no inclination to use this knowledge, even if he did have it, for his own falsification. We expect from a forger the observation of historical minutiae. The ancient reader who did not possess our printed encyclopaedias would be rather suspicious if confronted with an unusual formula. In any case, he did not care for antiquated terminology. For this reason, Josephus generally simplifies or rejuvenates the old-fashioned formulas in the documents he quotes. Thus, the heading of the Apostolic Decrees proves that the document was really composed in the Apostolic Age.

It remains to be seen whether the statement given in the inscription of Artemidorus will fit the literary evidence. At first view the disagreement seems complete. It is obvious that Artemidorus, conqueror in the Capitoline games in 86, could not already have been a victorious athlete before 55. But let us examine his career. Since Cilicia was formed as a separate province in 72, we have to place, it seems, two victories of Artemidorus in the quinquennial "common" games of Syria and Cilicia in Antioch not later than 68 and 72.<sup>39</sup> But that

<sup>38</sup> See *Rev. Hist. Relig.*, CXV (1937), p. 193; P. Collomp, *Actes du IV Congrès de Papyrologie* (1936), p. 202. See, e.g., two identical letters of C. Norbanus Flaccus sent to Ephesus (Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 40) and Sardes (Josephus, *A. J.*, XVI, 6, 6).

<sup>39</sup> We do not know the date of the contests. A. Dieudonné, *Rev. Numism.*, 1927, p. 49, interprets a coin of Antioch of 66-67 as referring

would extend his victorious course to eighteen years, at least, and thus make him win in 86 at the age of forty. Since the pancratium was the most violent contest, a combination of wrestling and boxing, and since, on the other hand, the Capitoline victory was the most coveted prize, it is obvious that the "world's champion" of 86 could not have been older than thirty at this date.<sup>40</sup> In fact, he was probably not 28 years old in 86.<sup>41</sup> Thus, he could not have won in the "common" games of Syria Phoenicia and Cilicia before 77. The calculation shows that, as Mommsen has already suggested,<sup>42</sup> the "common" games continued even after Cilicia had been separated from Syria, at least until about A. D. 80. Although Cilicia preserved its own *koinon*, the confederation might have wished in 55, for some local or accidental reasons, to continue the partnership with the Syrian *koinon*. The Roman government did not encourage the formation of interprovincial bodies but did not necessarily dissolve a partnership once formed around the imperial altar. There were *Tres Galliae*, but they continued to have the common altar of Augustus near Lugudunum. If the Cilicians, at the

to the games, but this explication is contested by H. Gaebler, *Zeitschr. f. Num.*, 1929, p. 310. That the games were quinquennial follows from the inscription of Artemidorus which sums up the number of victories won in the pentaeteric games. I do not know whether or not the contest was identical with the "Olympia" of Antioch.

<sup>40</sup> On the age of athletes cf. L. Robert, *Rev. de Phil.*, 1930, p. 29. T. Flavius Archibius was about 22 years old when, in 98, he won in the pancratium at the Capitoline games in the class of men. He conquered at Olympia in 101 and 105, but finished only second in the Capitoline contests of 102 and 106. See *I.G.R.*, I, 446.

<sup>41</sup> Artemidorus won twice at Olympia, certainly in 81 and 85. Although he won fifty times in the quinquennial games, he was never more than twice victor in the same festival, except the "common games" of Asia in Smyrna where he won first in the class of ἀγέμενοι and then twice in the class of men. Obviously, in 86, he was more than eight and less than twelve years a competitor within the class of "men" in the games. Since one entered this class after 20, Artemidorus was in 86 about 25 to 28 years old. Note that, although he won five times at Sardes, four times at Tralles and so on, that does not mean that he was in the ring sixteen or twenty years. Each city had many quinquennial games. See e.g. for Tralles, L. Robert, *Études Anatoliennes* (1937), p. 421.

<sup>42</sup> Mommsen (*op. cit.*, *supra*, n. 18), p. 173, n. 1. Previously (see the paper quoted in n. 34, *supra*) I suggested that the festival has preserved an antiquated name. Louis Robert, however, has pointed out, in a private communication, that this hypothesis is very improbable.

accession of Nero, in 55, wished to worship not only at Tarsus but at Antioch as well "the Emperor whom the world expected and hoped for,"<sup>43</sup> the government could not help but accede to this devout demand. The precedent once set, the festival at Antioch remained common for Cilicia and Syria for some twenty-five years at least. But the festal union was dissolved before Trajan or at the beginning of his reign. A coin of Antioch, minted between 100 and 102, bears the legend: *Kouὸν Συρίας*,<sup>44</sup> and so indicates the definitive secession of Cilicia from the Antiochene organization.

ELIAS J. BICKERMAN.

ÉCOLE LIBRE DES HAUTES ÉTUDES, NEW YORK.

<sup>43</sup> I quote an Egyptian announcement of Nero's accession *ap. A. S. Hunt, C. C. Edgar, Select Papyri*, II, 235.

<sup>44</sup> A. Dieudonné, *Rev. Numism.*, 1927, p. 8. Under Hadrian an athlete won at the Cilician games at Tarsus and at the Syrian festival at Antioch (*C. I. G.*, II, 2810).

ARISTOTLE'S FOUR SPECIES OF TRAGEDY  
(*POETICS* 18) AND THEIR IMPORTANCE  
FOR DRAMATIC CRITICISM.

The four classes of tragedy mentioned in *Poetics* 18 have been studied chiefly because they offer a textual problem. Is it possible that they are of importance for Aristotle's theory? The fourth class, not named in our present texts, is sometimes said to be the spectacular, sometimes the simple. The *Poetics* lists the other three as the complex, the pathetic, and that dependent on character. This group of four is said to depend on a group of four constituent parts of tragedy already mentioned, which, however, it is now "impossible to find in the earlier chapters."<sup>1</sup> The one group that seems pertinent is of six: plot, character, thought, language, music, spectacle (6, 50 a 7-15; 12, 52 b 14). Yet the only exact correspondence between the two groups is that of character. Plot, from the earlier group, is represented among the four by the complex, and also by the pathetic, for *pathos*, defined as "destructive or painful action, such as death on the stage, bodily agony, wounds and the like," is said by Aristotle to be part of the plot (11, 52 b 10).<sup>2</sup> This breaking up of plot suggests that the lost group of four was formed on a principle not stated in the present text of the *Poetics*. Yet since three of its elements are known, the fourth should be discoverable.

1. The Species in the *Poetics*.

In the *Poetics* as it stands, the plot is the constituent most thoroughly treated. A tragedy cannot exist without a plot as its soul. This plot or action—in Aristotle's opinion—is a unit from which nothing can be removed without damage to the whole. At its clearest, it shows a single change of fortune, from good to bad or the reverse. These are basic requirements for all plots. But plots of this simple form do not in themselves produce the most

<sup>1</sup> Ingram Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (Oxford, 1909), note on 18, 55 b 32.

<sup>2</sup> Butcher's translation. The active sense of *pathos*, at least to the extent of meaning display of emotion, is kept in 19, 56 b 1, where the *pathe* are said to be pity, fear, anger, and the like.



evident effect. For that the author must select or devise a story that has not only the elements of the simple action but also additional ones, namely recognition and reversal. The drama formed on such a narrative is classed as complex. Most tragedies, including all those assigned primarily to the three other classes, have simple plots.

If, then, there be a class of tragedies called simple because their plots are simple, their classification is negative. A simple plot—though it can be excellent—has nothing distinctive; it merely lacks some of the components of the complex plot.<sup>3</sup> It is convenient to say that one pathetic tragedy is complex and another simple, but that is different from making simplicity the reason for an independent class. The complex tragedy has its recognitions and reversals, the pathetic its scenes of suffering, the tragedy of character its striking persons, but the simple tragedy as such has nothing but the possibility of adding to itself material belonging to one of the other classes. The emendation meaning *simple*, as has long been recognized,<sup>4</sup> rests on chapter 24, where the *Iliad* is said to be simple and pathetic, the *Odyssey* complex and concerned with character.

But is it necessary to suppose that in chapter 24 Aristotle is dealing with the four species of chapter 18? The first words of that chapter run thus: *ἔτι δὲ τὰ εἶδη ταῦτα δεῖ ἔχειν τὴν ἐποποιίαν τῇ πραγμδίᾳ, ἣ γὰρ ἀπλὴν ἢ πεπλεγμένην ἢ ἡθικὴν ἢ παθητικὴν*. To those who accept the reading *simple* in chapter 18, this passage must appear to give precisely the four classes there discussed. Those, however, who prefer the reading *spectacular* evidently do not take the four classes named in the quotation as equivalent to those of chapter 18, nor can they be so taken by those who look on simplicity as a negative quality unable to dominate a play. For justification, such readers may have recourse to the paragraph as a whole, rather than merely to its first words or to its statement that the *Iliad* is simple and pathetic, the *Odyssey* complex and admirable in the use of character. When Aristotle says

<sup>3</sup> "The principle of division being positive, according to the actual source of the effect, we must not look for a species of tragedy called 'uninvolved'" [i.e., simple] (Lane Cooper, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* [Boston, 1913], p. 62).

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, the comment of Vincentius Madius (Venice, 1550), p. 194. Gudeman reaffirms it in his note on 24, 59 b 8. Cf. also his notes on 18, 55 b 32; 10, 52 a 11; 11, 52 b 9.

that epic is like tragedy in being simple or complex or full of character or pathetic, is his list to be taken as one, two, three, four, or do simple or complex, expressive of character or pathetic, form pairs of opposing units?<sup>5</sup> The first two form such a pair, and the statement about *Iliad* and *Odyssey* hints at a second pair. A tragedy or an epic can be simple and characteristic, but can it be characteristic and pathetic? Not unless the poet had gone far toward making all his parts superior, as Aristotle's contemporaries demanded;<sup>6</sup> yet the opposition of pathos and character is not absolute, as is that of simple and complex. Moreover, in the first ten lines of chapter 24 Aristotle speaks three times of elements determining the three undisputed species of chapter 18, namely (1) reversals, and recognitions (a unit causing complexity), and (2) scenes of suffering (causing pathos). He also twice mentions components from his list of six; these are (1) thought, (2) language, and (3) character. Plot and character, then, are represented in the list of four and the list of six. Such importance for character is to be expected, since Aristotle places it second only to plot in his discussion of the six components of tragedy (6, 50 a 39). With thought, it is one of the causes of dramatic action (6, 50 a 1-2), and character, rather than spectacle, is said to be the proper cause of the solution of tragic action (15, 54 a 37).<sup>7</sup> In addition Aristotle brings into this passage in chapter 24 the elements of thought and diction from his list of six, while excluding music and spectacle. Thus two further members of the list of six come into relation with the three qualities that determine species. Thought, as one of the three things imitated by tragedy, is worthy to be ranked with character, while language or diction is ranked with music (6, 49 b 38-50 a 11), as having a lower place than thought in its relation to the art of poetry.<sup>8</sup> It seems possible that this paragraph in chapter 24—part of the discussion of epic in relation to tragedy—has as its primary purpose to characterize the *Iliad* and

<sup>5</sup> Is this faintly suggested in Bywater's translation: "either simple or complex, a story of character or one of suffering"?

<sup>6</sup> 18, 56 a 2-7. See p. 370, below.

<sup>7</sup> Rostagni and Gudeman agree on a reading so to be translated. The older text makes the solution result from plot.

<sup>8</sup> *Poetics* 19, 56 b 19. Diction can be most striking where thought and character are not apparent (24, 60 b 5), yet it is also mentioned in close association with thought (19, 56 a 34).

the *Odyssey* according to a formula suitable for the drama. The *Odyssey* is complex and presents character; the *Iliad* is pathetic and, in contrast with the other poem, simple; both poems are better than any others in thought and diction, though not characterized by either quality. Reference to these characteristics carries with it a reminder about the six parts and the four species. There is one puzzling omission. After the assertion that there must be peripeties and recognitions and scenes of suffering, comes the statement that thought and diction should be well handled. Why is there no reference to character, named both before and after? It seems, then, that this paragraph is not so clear as to justify an otherwise unsupported belief that the simple tragedy is the fourth kind intended in chapter 18.

Those who do not allow the simple as the fourth class commonly make it the spectacular. This belief rests on three letters in the manuscripts taken to form part of the word for spectacle.<sup>9</sup> Spectacle is first mentioned in the *Poetics* immediately after the definition of tragedy. That definition lays stress on the acting of tragedy—a subject of importance in the preceding chapters. Having given the definition, the text continues: ἐπεὶ δὲ πρᾶττοντες ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν, πρῶτον μὲν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἂν εἴη τι μῦριον τραγωδίας ὁ τῆς ὀψεως κόσμος (6, 49 b 31-3). Spectacle is put first as the first thing that strikes the person who enters the theatre; as Bywater says: "Aristotle is thinking not of the poet but of the performers."<sup>10</sup> The remainder of the six parts are then noted: music, diction, plot, character, and thought. There are several later mentions of spectacle. As one of the advantages of acted drama over epic poetry, it is the source of a great deal of pleasure,<sup>11</sup> and can do something toward producing the proper

<sup>9</sup> In the manuscripts the three letters *ons* (given by editors as *δης*) follow the word *τέταρτον*. The three letters have been thought to be part of the word *ὄψις*, both by those who make the fourth class the spectacular, and by Butcher, who does not (see note 15, below). See note 40, below.

<sup>10</sup> On 6, 49 b 31. Gudeman also comments: "Handelnde verlangen einen örtlichen Schauplatz für ihre Betätigung, im Drama also die Bühne, auf der die Handlung für den Zuschauer versinnbildlicht wird" (on 6, 49 b 32).

<sup>11</sup> 26, 62 a 16-17. I accept Gudeman's text; the usual text excludes spectacle as a special source of pleasure, though making it, with music, important.

tragic emotions of pity and fear, though it is better that these feelings be aroused by the combination of events in the action (6, 50 b 17; 14, 53 b 1); moreover, there is a danger that the feelings aroused by the spectacle will not be suited to tragedy; stage-effects will be stared at with wonder but will not rouse fear (14, 53 b 1). With music, spectacle is to be put in a lower class than plot, character, thought, and diction, four parts that manifest their quality when a tragedy is merely read (6, 50 b 18-19; 26, 62 a 12 and 16). Spectacle, indeed, is rather the art of the stage-designer than of the poet, for, though it can take one's breath away, it requires the least tragic ability and is the least bound up with the art of poetry of all the components (6, 50 b 17-20; 14, 53 b 7-8). Aristotle's tragic poet writes with the stage in view (15, 54 b 16; 17, 55 a 22-32), but his concern is with the stage effects that are inseparable from the written text. In the sixth chapter itself, though he begins with spectacle as the first thing observed in a stage presentation, he soon abandons this *ἀτεχνότατον* part of tragedy and turns to those that come home to the poet himself. He then discusses the parts in the order of their importance as (1) plot, (2) character, (3) thought, (4) diction, (5) music, (6) spectacle, with the warning that mastery over the last belongs more to the art of scene-designing than to that of poetry.<sup>12</sup> From this point on, his interest is in the art of the poet.<sup>13</sup> Indeed Bywater goes so far as to say that "throughout the Poetics Aristotle resolutely ignores" costume and stage-management "as outside the art of poetry proper."<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> In spite of the space given to diction in chapters 19-22, it seems not quite on the basis of the other parts. Aristotle passes over enquiry into one aspect of it as not belonging to the art of poetry (19, 56 b 18). Music is in a lower group than any of the others, being one of the *ἡδύσματα* or pleasurable accessories of tragedy (6, 50 b 16). Gudeman comments on 6, 49 b 32: "Wenn Aristoteles die *ὄψις* als einen *κόσμος* bezeichnet, so geht daraus zunächst hervor, dass er sie ebenso wie die gleich darauf genannten *μελοποιία* (= *μέλος*) und *λέξις* (hier als *τῶν μέτρων σύστασις* definiert) zu den *ἡδύσματα* zählt. *τι* enthält, wie üblich, eine Einschränkung und deutet darauf hin, dass *ὄψις* von einem anderen Gesichtspunkt aus betrachtet doch nur bedingtermassen ein Teil der Tragödie ist, weil sie unter den sechs *μέρη* allein *ἄτεχνος* und überhaupt nicht Sache des Dichters, sondern des *σκευοποιός* ist." He has in mind *ἡδυσμένον* (6, 49 b 25, 28) and *ἡδύσματα* (6, 50 b 16), with his comment on those passages.

<sup>13</sup> In chapter 26, however, Aristotle returns to tragedy on the stage.

<sup>14</sup> On 15, 54 b 15, Castelvetro speaks of the things that pertain "alla

In giving his four species and four parts in chapter 18, then, Aristotle is dealing with what pertains to poetic art rather than that of the scene-designer. It is probable also that the lost earlier passage in which he dealt with the four parts considered them as pertaining to the poet's craft. If so, the fourth part of chapter 18 cannot be the spectacular.<sup>15</sup>

Thought, however, comes in the third place of importance, after character, and diction comes in the fourth (6, 50 a 39, b 4). Either of these has a better claim to a position in Aristotle's group of four than has spectacle. Thought, in fact, is said by the Philosopher to have a function close to the feelings indispensable to tragedy, for it may prepare the essential *πάθη*, such as pity, or fear, or anger (19, 56 a 38). Moreover, thought, along with character, is one of the two causes for dramatic action (6, 50 a 1-2).

But whatever the fourth part is, these parts are to be used in determining the species of tragedy, since a tragedy is classified according to that one of the four most prominent in it. Suffering, character, and thought appear in some measure in all tragedies whether simple or complex, and complexity, when present, adds to interest. Yet the tragic effect, though derived from all elements, will depend mainly on the constituent most prominent.<sup>16</sup> Aristotle says, then, immediately following his account of the four species and four corresponding parts or constituents: *μάλιστα μὲν οὖν ἅπαντα δεῖ πειρᾶσθαι ἔχειν, εἰ δὲ μὴ, τὰ μέγιστα καὶ πλείεστα* (18, 56 a 2-4). The passage, especially the word *ἅπαντα*, has been variously translated, with some tendency to avoid an exact equivalent. Bywater writes: "The poet's aim, then, should be to combine every element of interest." Butcher: "The poet

vista, & all'harmonia" as "non necessarie, ne principali della tragedia." He makes "teatro, palco, maschere, . . . canti, suoni" merely "seguaci della poetica" though "compagne" of tragedy as acted (p. 344). Rostagni speaks of spectacle as extraneous (*La Poetica di Aristotele* [Torino, 1934], p. lix).

<sup>15</sup> Butcher, translating chapter 18, adds to the passage on the fourth species the bracketed sentence: "We here exclude the purely spectacular element." This is a device for being true to Aristotle's thought and yet placating those who see in three unintelligible letters in the manuscripts part of the word meaning spectacle.

<sup>16</sup> "Where the course of the drama is 'uninvolved' [i. e., simple] . . . any tragic effect a play may have is likely to arise from some element other than plot" (Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 62).



should endeavor, if possible, to combine all poetic merits." Susemihl's translation makes *ἅπαντα* refer to the species, and Gudeman explains that it means "die vier eben besprochenen *εἶδη*," that is, the species.<sup>17</sup> Rostagni, however, says that we should understand *ἅπαντα τὰ μέρη*, or all the parts, "cioè 'tutte' le quattro *parti*, menzionate in rapporto alle diverse specie di Tragedia."<sup>18</sup> Such a belief is supported by the occurrence of *μέρος* in the next sentence (18, 56 a 6). Moreover, Bywater and Gudeman quote, as depending on the passage now in question, Polybius, XVI, 20, 2: *δεῖ [τοὺς συγγραφεῖς] μάλιστα μὲν πειρᾶσθαι πάντων κρατεῖν τῶν τῆς ἱστορίας μερῶν· καλὸν γάρ· εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο δυνατόν, τῶν ἀναγκαιωτάτων καὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἐν αὐτῇ πλείστην ποιεῖσθαι πρόνοιαν*. If Polybius is taken as an interpreter, *ἅπαντα* obviously refers to *τὰ μέρη*, the four parts.<sup>19</sup> This seems likely, because, as the translations of Butcher and Bywater indicate, Aristotle is advising a poet to attempt to do as well as he can with as many as possible of the normal components of tragedy. There seems, on the other hand, no reason why the Philosopher should advise a poet to attempt to do well in as many as possible of the various species. This advice to make all the parts as good as possible is given because critics have censured the poets improperly.

This censure is explained in a further clause, difficult partly because of its brevity: *γεγονότων γὰρ καθ' ἕκαστον μέρος ἀγαθῶν ποιητῶν, ἐκάστου τοῦ ἰδίου ἀγαθοῦ ἀξιοῦσι τὸν ἓνα ὑπερβάλλειν*. Bywater renders it: "Just because there have been poets before him strong in the several species of tragedy, the critics now expect the one man to surpass that which was the strong point of each one of his predecessors." Epps does not thus pass over the word *μέρος* or *part* but renders: "Just because there have

<sup>17</sup> I now regret that I followed him in my own translation of the *Poetics* (*Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden* [New York, 1940], p. 96).

<sup>18</sup> Rostagni goes still further in holding that Aristotle had earlier said pretty much the same thing, namely that one or more of the six parts (plot, character, thought, language, music, and spectacle) may be unimportant in a particular tragedy (6, 50 a 13-15).

<sup>19</sup> Giovan Giorgio Trissino writes: "Essendo buoni Poeti in ciascuna di queste parti, vorrebbono che parimente in tutte le altre fussero eccellenti" (*Poetica* [Venice, 1563], p. 15v). And Pazzi: "Ad taxandos poetas haec aetas in tantum prona est, ut quos in omnibus his partibus probandos noverit, in singulis etiam mirum in modum excellere aequum censeat" (From Madius, *In Aristotelis Librum de Poeticis Communes Explanationes* [Venice, 1550], sect. 93).

been poets who were, each of them, good in the use of some one of these essential elements [i. e., parts], people now think that one man should surpass all the individual excellencies of previous poets."<sup>20</sup> But if the explanation in the preceding paragraph is correct, this entire clause continues the discussion of the parts. It is unlikely, then, that while the first section of this clause carries on the reference to those parts, the last turns to excellencies in general. There is, therefore, presumably a reference to the four parts in the last part of the clause, especially since it concludes the discussion of the topic. If so, Aristotle's meaning, when his compressed statement is expanded, is as follows: "The critics misrepresent the poets, for it is true that there have been poets good at using in a play one, and only one, of these four parts, but critics now expect any poet to do as well, in a single play, with all four parts as an earlier poet has done with the one part he was most skilful in." Aristotle did wish the poet to do as well as he could with the largest possible number of parts. Yet he saw that the critics were asking for an excellence impossible to tragedy. His own classification of tragedies according to one leading element, based on wide observation of tragedy, showed what the poets up to his time had attained, and led him to think that no more could be asked. No tragic author could be expected to do strikingly well with more than one of the four elements in a single play.<sup>21</sup> If the classification into four species according to the one dominating part of each tragedy is not generally applicable it is useless.

## 2. A Pathetic Tragedy: *Ajax*.

To make his four species clearer, Aristotle has given examples of three of them. Though none are named for the complex tragedy, various references point to the *Oedipus King*, where much of the interest is in the concatenation of events, as the hero is enmeshed tighter and tighter. That tragedy "is concerned chiefly with the detection of a crime, but differs from a modern detective story in that the audience knows from the start

<sup>20</sup> Preston H. Epps, *The Poetics of Aristotle* (Chapel Hill, 1942), p. 36.

<sup>21</sup> In exceptional cases he might have allowed that two of the elements were evenly balanced. In chapter 24 he speaks of the *Odyssey* as complex and concerned with character. Even if this be allowed as a parallel, an example from epic is not decisive for the more limited form of tragedy.

who committed the crime, though the criminal does not; still more significantly, it arouses not only our curiosity but our deep emotions."<sup>22</sup> *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, in which the reader asks: Will Orestes escape? is also in this class. The tragedy of character is illustrated by *The Phthiotides* and *Peleus*, of which very little is known (18, 56 a 1-2).

The pathetic tragedy, says Aristotle, is represented by the *Ajaxes* and the *Ixions*. Our only survivor is the *Ajax* of Sophocles. The plot of this play has been censured as not unified, but has been so defended that little more need be said.<sup>23</sup> The strife over the burial is in truth an essential part of the story of suicide; the play could not have been complete if it had ended with the death of the hero. In the latter part, "the pathos and insistent claims of the dead body are reinforced by the child Eurysaces and Tecmessa, who kneel in silence by it and suggest that the dead man is waiting to be justified and restored to honour. Those who complain that the play falls into two separate parts tend to forget the presence of the body. It shows that the problem of Ajax is not yet solved, and explains why he is still a centre of fierce controversy."<sup>24</sup> Even the intervention of Odysseus, which approaches the *deus ex machina*, is prepared for when in an early line he expresses pity (121). Aristotle, then, need not have rejected the plot.

But is *Ajax* ruled by pathos—a quality mentioned in the quotation just above, though with no evident thought of Aristotle?<sup>25</sup> It appears early in the tragedy, when the mad Ajax, having slain and tortured sheep and cattle, exults as though he had found revenge on his foes. His enemy Odysseus pities him

<sup>22</sup> William Chase Greene, *Moirai* (Cambridge, 1944), p. 154. Though recognizing that plot is first, he does not forget that the work is a tragedy.

<sup>23</sup> Jebb, *The Ajax* (Cambridge, 1896), pp. xxviii-xxxix; Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophocles* (Berlin, 1917), pp. 51-2, 67-8; C. M. Bowra, *Sophoclean Tragedy* (Oxford, 1944), p. 18; Thomas D. Goodell, *Athenian Tragedy* (New Haven, 1920), p. 220. William Chase Greene writes: "Doubtless an Attic audience was conscious of no slackening of dramatic interest even though the hero falls on his sword when the play is not much more than half over" (*op. cit.*, p. 148).

<sup>24</sup> Bowra, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

<sup>25</sup> In such criticism of *Ajax* as I have seen, there is no mention of Aristotle's remark in the *Poetics*.

in his misery, for he reflects that he too might have the same lot. Then come the chorus, pierced to the heart by rumors of their leader's strange conduct, yet forced to admit it:

*ἦτοι γὰρ ἂν θεία νόσος* (186).

Tecmessa confirms their worst fears for their leader, bringing to themselves—dependent on Ajax—fear of death by stoning. Ajax's recovery of his sanity, which the Chorus hail as a blessing, is but a double sorrow; Tecmessa not only grieves for her husband but with him, as he realizes what he has done. Ajax himself sits among the beasts he has slaughtered. He can see nothing before him but death, bringing delight to his enemies. Tecmessa exhorts him by the sufferings he will bring on herself, by the grief of his father and mother. He is unmoved, leaving his son in the charge of his followers and of Teucer. With ironical words he departs alone, bearing the sword of Hector. Then, too late, the messenger arrives with a charge that might have saved the hero's life, and Tecmessa realizes that Ajax has deceived her into thinking the danger past. In the next scene, the hero, having lamented the possibility—terrible to a Greek—that his enemies may cast his body to the dogs and birds, carries through his suicide—one of those deaths *ἐν τῷ φανερόν* that Aristotle marked as especially pathetic (11, 52 b 12). His body is found by Tecmessa, who with the chorus laments his and their own fate, helpless before the sons of Atreus. Teucer, from whom they hope for support, expresses equal weakness. Menelaus enters to embody their fears, declaring that Ajax shall not have burial. Teucer in his devotion makes the scene darker as he appals the chorus by his insults to the leader. When Agamemnon appears, the grief of Teucer carries him still farther, and all hope seems gone. But Odysseus with cool rationality averts the wrath of the king and secures burial for the dead man. In pathetic persistence, Teucer, still mindful in his gratitude that Odysseus was an enemy to the dead, rejects further aid.

The action of this tragedy is evidently simple. On recovering from his madness, Ajax moves straight on to his death. Teucer returns only when, in the normal course of events, he has finished his expedition. Menelaus and then his brother come on the spur of the moment, with no design other than the immediate one of forbidding burial. Yet there is no unexpectedness in their coming, for they have been often mentioned throughout the

play. Odysseus, also named several times, carries out the spirit of the early speeches caused by his view of the mad Ajax. He comes, then, as not wholly unexpected, though without special reason. Moreover, he achieves no spectacular success but wins by argument a grudging assent from Agamemnon, even himself admitting that he works in his own interest; he departs without display when his further aid is rejected. The action is toned down to the utmost to give opportunity for the direct expression of the foreboding, grief, and anger of all the characters, without diverting any attention to involved actions or striking, unexpected accidents.

The characters, such as Teucer in his devotion to Ajax, living and dead, are admirably represented, but they are controlled by the pathos of the play. What their qualities may be in a more general way is not suggested. To pathos, too, are subdued most of the statements of general truths, in which the element of thought appears:

ὁρῶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν  
εἶδωλ', ὅσοι περ ζῶμεν, ἣ κούφην σκιάν (125-6).

ἐν τῷ θεῷ πᾶς καὶ γελᾷ κώδύρεται (383).

τοῖς θανοῦσί τοι  
φιλοῦσι πάντες κειμένοις ἐπεγγεῶν (988-9).

πρὶν ἰδεῖν δ' οὐδεὶς μάντις  
τῶν μελλόντων, ὅ τι πράξει (1419-20).

Thought on a pathetic subject, directly applied to the fears of the speakers, appears in the discussion of Tecmessa and the Chorus whether one in distress would prefer happy friends, or whether it is better for all to feel woe (265-77). The intellectual element comes chiefly in the speeches of Menelaus, Agamemnon, and Odysseus. But thought, though fairly important, is subdued to pathos. No one would think of the play as dealing with the self-restraint proper to the ruler. Even artful diction is not lacking, as

πόνος πόνῳ πόνον φέρει (866).

But for all its richness, *Ajax* is dominated by the element of suffering. The Philosopher rightly chose it as a tragedy of pathos.



3. A Tragedy of Thought: *Prometheus Bound*.

Aristotle's illustrations for the fourth class of tragedy are difficult for us. First is *The Phorcydes*. This seemingly was a satyric drama. Gudeman, as though feeling something strange in an illustration from a drama not purely tragic, comments: "Die Möglichkeit, dass eins von diesen Stücken gemeint ist, [die] kann nicht bestritten werden, stutzig macht nur die Tatsache, dass A. sonst in der Poetik das Satyr drama nie eingehend berücksichtigt oder als solches zitiert."<sup>26</sup> But much more than that, it seems impossible that Aristotle exemplified one of his types of tragedy by naming a play that does not belong to that class.<sup>27</sup> There must have been on the subject a tragic drama now unknown to us.

The second example is given by some editors in the singular number, by others as plural, yet either permits reference to the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus.<sup>28</sup> Aristotle's mention of scenes in the lower world is not now helpful.<sup>29</sup> My discussion depends on the belief that Aristotle intended *Prometheus Bound* as one of his

<sup>26</sup> Note on 18, 56 a 2. He mentions as possible exceptions *Odysseus the False Messenger* (16, 55 a 14) and *Sisyphus* (18, 56 a 22). The first relates to a recognition, which might be illustrated from any sort of narrative. The second is possibly a reference merely to the story of *Sisyphus*. Gudeman remarks (note on 18, 56 a 22) that no situation such as Aristotle seems to have in mind can be discovered. Bywater, making no attempt to explain *Sisyphus*, assumes that the examples were from actual tragedies (note on 18, 56 a 21). His assumption is supported by the context, which deals with what is especially tragic.

<sup>27</sup> Even though satyr-plays have been referred to as tragedies (Seymour M. Pitcher, "The 'Anthus' of Agathon," *A. J. P.*, LX [1939], p. 155), it seems that Aristotle would not without warning have set up a class of tragedy to be exemplified only by them. If he could not find a tragedy of pure type to illustrate a species, would he have allowed the species to stand?

<sup>28</sup> So Rostagni and Gudeman. Bywater mentions only a satiric drama, in spite of his assumption in commenting on *Sisyphus* (see the preceding note). Fyfe, with a reference to satyr-plays, asserts that the *Prometheus* here mentioned "is certainly not . . . *Prometheus Bound*" (*Aristotle's Art of Poetry* [Oxford, 1940], p. 51, note). Whether *Prometheus Bound* is by Aeschylus or not is not important for my purpose.

<sup>29</sup> Rostagni says that these "dovevano costituire quasi un genere particolare" (*ad loc.*). Trissino makes the fourth species "quella degli inferi" (*op. cit.* [note 19], p. 16— *quinta divisione*).

examples. The plot of this play, like that of *Ajax*, has been much attacked. The tenor of criticism may be represented by Fontenelle's remarks:

On ne sait ce que c'est que le *Prométhée d'Eschile*. Il n'y a ni sujet ni dessein, mais des emportemens fort poétiques & fort hardis. Je crois qu'*Eschile* étoit une maniere de fou qui avoit l'imagination très-vive & pas trop réglée (*Oeuvres* [Paris, 1761], IX, p. 415).

The simple plot is indeed far from the complex one of *Oedipus King*. There is not even much progression within the mind of the hero, who seems about the same at the end as at the beginning. His visitors give him a chance to discourse on his state but hardly to change it. Io exhibits to the Titan another aspect of tyranny but does not modify his view of the spirit of Zeus. Yet the action at the beginning is striking, and the play is active throughout, more than in the coming of the interlocutors, for the spirit of the hero is dynamic, and demands the spectacular final scene. The chief sign of external movement is that connected with the secrets known to Prometheus, that of Io, which she desires to know, that of Prometheus' own deliverance, which excites the curiosity of the Oceanides, and above all that of the overthrow of Zeus, linked with the other two, which Prometheus refuses to Io and the nymphs, and which Hermes attempts to drag out of the Titan.

Turning away from plot, one observes that the dialogue, except for such portions as the narrative of Io's wandering, is marked by wise sayings:

τὸ ξυγγενές τοι δεινὸν ἢ θ' ὁμιλία (39).

κέρδιστον εὖ φρονοῦντα μὴ δοκεῖν φρονεῖν (387).

αὐθαδία γὰρ τῷ φρονοῦντι μὴ καλῶς  
αὐτὴ καθ' αὐτὴν οὐδενὸς μείζον σθένει (1012-13).

One is used to point the discussion of marriage:

τὸ κηδεῦσαι καθ' αὐτὸν ἀριστεύει μακρῷ (890).

A topic developed at length is man's advance from primitive to civilized life. But the chief subject is that of the tyrant, presented as in Aristotle's *Politics* and elsewhere, "for in *Prometheus Bound*, Zeus is a modern tyrant as seen by the

contemporaries of Harmodius and Aristogeiton."<sup>30</sup> The importance of this topic has been developed as follows:

The ministers of Zeus, appointed by him to escort Prometheus to his place of confinement, are Might and Violence, the son and daughter of Styx. The one signifies his power, the other the methods by which he uses it. He is described as harsh (202, 340: *τραχὺς*), as irresponsible (340: *οὐδ' ὑπεύθυνος*), as unconstitutional, acknowledging no laws but his own, a law to himself (159: *Ζεὺς ἀθέτως κρατύνει*, 419: *ἰδίοις νόμοις κρατύνων*, 202-3: *παρ' ἑαυτῷ τὸ δίκαιον ἔχων*). Further, he is suspicious of his friends—a trait which is expressly declared to be characteristic of the tyrant (240-1: *ἔνεστι γάρ πως τοῦτο τῇ τυραννίδι / νόσημα, τοῖς φίλοισι μὴ πεποιθέναι*),—implacable and impervious to persuasion (34: *Διὸς γὰρ δυσπαραίτητοι φρένες*, 199-201: *ἀκίχτητα γὰρ ἦθεα καὶ κέαρ / ἀπαράμυθον ἔχει Κρόνον παῖς*, 349: *πάντως γὰρ οὐ πείσεις νιν· οὐ γὰρ εὐπιθής*). Above all, in his treatment of Io, he reveals his violence. The brutality of this episode is not, as in the *Supplices*, veiled in lyric poetry: on the contrary, the poet seems to be at pains to fill the audience, like his own Oceanids, with abhorrence. Zeus tried first persuasion, and then threats, to bend the unhappy girl to his will. This is the method Prometheus expected of him (185-7), and it is typical of the tyrant. Hence the climax, when, breaking off his prediction of Io's future agonies, Prometheus turns to the Oceanids and cries (761-3):

ἄρ' ὑμῖν δοκεῖ  
ὁ τῶν θεῶν τύραννος ἐς τὰ πάνθ' ὁμῶς  
βίαιος εἶναι;<sup>31</sup>

To this theme are devoted further wise sayings or sentences:

*ἅπας δὲ τραχὺς ὅστις ἂν νέον κρατῇ* (35).

*οὐ κατ' ἰσχὺν οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ καρτερόν  
χρεῖη, δόλφ δὲ τοὺς ὑπερσχόντας κρατεῖν* (214-15).

*τραχὺς μόναρχος οὐδ' ὑπεύθυνος κρατεῖ* (326).

*ὅσον τό τ' ἄρχειν καὶ τὸ δουλεύειν δίχα* (927).

<sup>30</sup> Werner Jaeger, *Paideia* (New York, 1939), I, p. 250. "The character of Zeus in the *Prometheus Bound* is above all political" (Greene, *op. cit.*, p. 122).

<sup>31</sup> *Prometheus Bound*, ed. and trans. by George Thomson (Cambridge, 1932), p. 9; the line numbers are those of his translation. It well illustrates the neglect into which Aristotle's analysis of the Greek drama has fallen that Thomson writes this paragraph under the heading of characterization rather than of thought or *dianoia*. The same may be said of part of Richter's discussion (*Zur Dramaturgie des Aeschylus* [Leipzig, 1892], pp. 65-7).

With the subject are connected other sentences on human prudence and the tyranny of the gods.<sup>32</sup> As many discussions of the tragedy show, it is easy to carry its idea even as far as that of Christian martyrdom.<sup>33</sup> The structure of the play is suited to concrete presentation of tyranny. In the first scene Prometheus, fastened to the rock, is the victim of despotism, and as he speaks, held by his chains, the horror of injustice is ever before the spectator. The Titan's vivid recital of his devotion to the good of man is the opposite of the tyrant's attitude to his subjects. Oceanus is the ordinary man who will adapt himself to any government rather than undergo danger. Io is the victim of the monarch's lust and his wife's jealousy.<sup>34</sup> Hermes is the ruler's slave, truckling to his master, haughty to others. Prometheus at the end suffers increased violence from the oppressor's rage. If with such a plan the play is a great tragedy, the best work by its author save *Agamemnon*,<sup>35</sup> presenting the finest character in Aeschylus, its construction is at least good enough to enable the tragedy to produce a powerful effect. Is it too much to ask whether the author did not design an action admirably suited to carry out his purpose?<sup>36</sup>

<sup>32</sup> As in lines 17, 28, 43-4, 49-50, 103-5, 109-11, 150-1, 188-9, 252, 265-7, 306-8, 311-12, 324-5, 331, 337-8, 380, 473-5, 514, 536-8, 547-52, 624, 638-40, 685-6, 750-1, 901-2, 981, 1034-5, 1039. There are other sayings so well wrought into the dialogue that they are hardly to be classed as distinct sentences, as 629, 1072-3. The line numbers are from *Aeschyli Tragoediae*, edited by Sidgwick (Oxford, 1902).

<sup>33</sup> Richter, *op. cit.*, pp. 65, 78; Herbert W. Smyth, *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Berkeley, 1924), pp. 92-7; Greene, *op. cit.*, p. 117; Jaeger, *op. cit.*, I, p. 261.

<sup>34</sup> Lines 590, 703, 899. For a reference to the tyrant's wife, see Aristotle, *Politics* 1314 b 13.

<sup>35</sup> Richter, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 54, 64-5, 271, 280. William Chase Greene calls it "one of the most impressive and moving dramas ever composed" (*op. cit.*, p. 117). Werner Jaeger writes: "Poets and philosophers of all nations have for centuries loved *Prometheus Bound* far more than any other Greek drama, and they will always love it, as long as a spark of Prometheus' fire still burns in the human soul (*op. cit.*, I, p. 261). In one of the choral songs (553) "the chorus raises itself above emotion to pure contemplation, and so reaches the highest aim of all tragedy" (*ibid.*, p. 263).

<sup>36</sup> This is hinted at by Smyth (*op. cit.*, p. 100), though still in language derived from the conception of an abstract good plot: "Art has been forced to yield to necessity, or rather, it cooperates with necessity." Maurice Croiset acknowledges that the action suits "la condition

When the play is so considered, it gives a high place to the third element among the six making up a tragedy—namely thought or *dianoia*.<sup>37</sup> Thought appears in those passages “in which the characters show something by argument or utter a sententious saying” (6, 50 a 6); or in those in which characters “show something as it is or as it is not or present a general idea” (6, 50 b 11); “thought is shown in everything that the characters bring about by means of speech; the subdivisions are proof, refutation, arousing of emotion—pity, fear, anger, and the like—and the feeling that things are important or trivial” (19, 56 a 36-62). To this intellectual element the action of *Prometheus* is adapted; no other plot would so well carry the tragic pity and fear aroused by the speeches presenting the evil of tyranny.

This tragedy has other elements too. It has been said that its chorus “is nothing but pity and terror,”<sup>38</sup> and indeed they twice use Aristotle’s word *φρίττειν* (*Poetics* 14, 53 b 5) for the horror produced by tragedy (540, 695), and once his word *ἐλεειν* (*ibid.*) for pity (248). Io is a pitiable figure. Above all, Prometheus suffers, yet his stubborn courage is not subdued; he is not an Ajax. Suffering, however great, does not dominate the play.<sup>39</sup> The character of Prometheus won the admiration

acceptée par le poète”: “Il avait à inventer une action dont le principal acteur se trouvait condamné à demeurer toujours présent et à peu près immobile” (*Aeschyle* [Paris, 1928], p. 141).

<sup>37</sup> Note such expressions as “Prometheus, the hero of the intellectual world”; “in the core of [Prometheus’] character . . . there is and always was a philosophical element”; “the audience goes through the same experience as the chorus, and is meant to feel and learn the same things” (Jaeger, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 260, 261, 263). See also note 35 above.

“In the Prometheus trilogy, Aeschylus returns to the theme of strife and reconciliation, and develops it on a cosmic scale. Hardly shall we find elsewhere in Greek literature, or even in the Bible, so daring a conception, spanning aeons of time and the vastness of space, of material power at first in conflict with moral ideals and then at last interpenetrated by them; but throughout the process the various members of the natural order vibrate with human sympathy for the suffering Titan” (Greene, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-17). In this quotation the author points to the primacy of thought in the tragedy but recognizes also the element of pathos or suffering.

<sup>38</sup> Jaeger, *op. cit.*, I, p. 263.

<sup>39</sup> Gudeman, however, in Aristotelian language calls *Prometheus Bound* ἀπλή καὶ παθητική (note on *Poetics* 18, 56 a 2).



of Shelley, but there is no general exposition of mental traits; the courage of the hero is devoted to the one purpose of resisting the tyranny of Zeus. There is spectacle too; Oceanus comes on his sea-horse, but not to cause feelings of terror. More immediately tragic is the storm at the end, yet the last words of the stubborn Prometheus express not horror at the confusion of sky and sea, which cannot bring him death, but protest against injustice:

ἔκδικα πάσχω.

*Prometheus Bound*, then, asserts that tyranny is not final. Shelley is right in basing on it the concept of freedom expressed in his *Prometheus Unbound*, true sequel to the older play, though transformed as the passing of the ages requires:

To suffer woes which Hope thinks infinite;  
To forgive wrongs darker than death or night;  
To defy Power, which seems omnipotent;  
To love, and bear; to Hope till Hope creates  
From its own wreck the thing it contemplates;  
Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent;  
This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be  
Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free;  
This is alone Life, Joy, Empire, and Victory.

If we can trust the evidence of *Prometheus Bound*, Aristotle's fourth species is the tragedy of thought.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Perhaps some of diction enters too, for, as has been remarked above, Aristotle sometimes connects that element closely with thought.

Trissino makes the first three species of tragedy *la complicata, la passionale, la morale*. Of the fourth he says that in it "le parole denno havere il luoco precipuo" (*op. cit.*, p. 15v—*quinta divisione*). Franz Susemihl speaks of the "vier eigentlich-poetischen qualitativen [Theile] Fabel, Charaktere, Reflexion und sprachlicher Ausdruck" (*Aristoteles über die Dichtkunst* [Leipzig, 1865], p. 187). Margoliouth in his translation makes the fourth class "the Tragedy of appropriate expression." In his note he says that *Prometheus* "has little of a plot, is more philosophical than psychological, and the characters are too far removed from us to arouse much sympathy; the success of the poet lies, then, in this—that he has made them speak in language worthy of the gods and the like."

There is perhaps some textual support for making the fourth species that of thought. Ralph Nash suggests that in 18, 56 a 2 the letters *ons* may be part of the word *νόησις*. This does not occur in the present

## 4. The Consequences for Dramatic Criticism.

The preceding development of the species of tragedy is important for the interpretation of the *Poetics*, in that it modifies the usual conception of the Aristotelian plot. One must still hold that Aristotle recommends a clear and well-wrought action for all plays, that he makes the complex plot—when skilfully used—the most effective, and even that, as a counsel of perfection, he exhorts the dramatist to be admirable in as many as possible of the four constituent parts of tragedy (to wit, complexity, pathos, character, and—as I believe—thought). But yet he accompanies this exhortation with a disapproving reference to critics who make the improper demand that a poet should show all the parts at their best in a single play. As has been said,<sup>41</sup> this implies that Aristotle's observation had convinced him that a poet could not be expected to distinguish himself in the use of more than one of the four components in any single play. Hence, when he says that any one of the four can dominate a class of tragedy, he thereby relaxes all that is excessive in his demands for the plot abstractly best. Indeed, since the structure of such of his examples as we know has required defense, he is allowing or even recommending such plots as some of his followers have thought non-Aristotelian. He did not hold an absolute and rigid conception of structure, but asked what sort

*Poetics*, though used by Aristotle in his other writings. Though not a synonym of *διάνοια*, as Plato (*Rep.* 511 D 25-E 28) explains, it is but one remove from it. If Aristotle were explaining that the fourth class was dominated by the mind at work, he might well have used *νόησις*. This is used by Plato (*Rep.* 529 B) in contrast with *δύμωσι*, and by Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* 1170 a 17; *De Inc. Animal.* 701 a 36; *Metaphysics* 1036 a 6) as well as Plato (*Tim.* 28 A) in contrast to *αἴσθησις*. This latter word Aristotle twice uses in the *Poetics* with reference to the spectacle. In the first (7, 51 a 7) it is opposed to *τέχνη*, the poet's art. In the second (15, 54 b 16), it has long been understood to refer to matters relating to stage production (Gudeman lists various early expositors; Castelvetro, p. 344, may be added). If Aristotle's fourth class depends on the intellect, he may have chosen for it a word opposed to the visual part of presented tragedy. If in a lost passage on the four parts, preceding chapter 15, he emphasized the intellectual element germane to poetic art, he perhaps wrote the passage in chapter 15 to remind his audience that even the poet in his study should not forget that his tragedy is to be acted.

<sup>41</sup> P. 370, above.

would best serve to carry out the dominant quality in a tragedy. An action not abstractly the best may be best suited to the nature of a given play. In so far, however, as a playwright can develop the other elements by means of a complex plot, his work will be so much the more effective. But the action is an organic member, not something apart from the other elements. The Philosopher, then, is better than most of his followers.

When Aristotle has had restored to him his power to observe the varying types of tragedy and to appreciate organic subordination even of plot, his methods again become possible models. Our newspaper critics, if they wish to do more than indicate to tired businessmen that a play is amusing, can learn something from Greek procedure. Criticism at present tends to retain, without enthusiasm, the abstract view of plot traditionally held by Aristotelians and as a result by most men. Hence critics now rarely deal specifically with a play as an organic unit; they turn rather to observations on character or to exposition of the social views of the author. Such matters must be noted, but to treat them in isolation, though it is to study dramatic material, is not to be a critic. If a drama of social protest, for example, is to be analyzed as something other than a pamphlet or a speech from the soap box, its author must be tested as a playwright. He is not a good one unless his social ideas, or whatever dominates his work, are expressed through a suitable plot controlled by them. If the artist elects to use a plot that does not give scope to all his ideas, he must drop some of them. The writer of a good play can, if his plot is fixed, go only so far as it lets him, and no further, just as Milton could assert eternal Providence only to the height of his great argument, that is, so far as his story allowed him to do it. If exposition is an author's desire, he should turn to a form of writing that does not have action as its soul. The dramatic critic, then, when he follows the sensible and truly scientific method so briefly outlined by the Master of Those Who Know, will observe the relation of the components in the play before him and will ask to what extent they are united in an organism fitted to the stage. He will observe the individual piece from within, rather than bring to it a set of rules.

ALLAN H. GILBERT.

DUKE UNIVERSITY.

## GNAEUS ALLEIUS NIGIDIUS MAIUS OF POMPEII.

In a recent issue of *A. J. P.* (LXVIII [1947], p. 19) mention was made of a proposal for the revision of the current chronological treatment of the painted notices on the walls of Pompeian edifices; and, as a corollary to this, a new interpretation of two familiar monuments of that city, the reconstructed stage setting of the great theater and the altar with marble reliefs in the forecourt of the temple "of Vespasian." The traditional hospitality of *A. J. P.* now permits the submitting of the evidence and the presentation of the line of reasoning which have appeared to justify a fresh approach to matters regarding which it might have been assumed—at least by those not familiar with the course of such studies—that the last word had long since been uttered.

As a preliminary step, it is necessary to clarify one's ideas regarding the wall-inscriptions of Pompeii, and in particular the electoral propaganda and the notices of games.

No one who has enjoyed the good fortune of visiting the more recently excavated quarters of Pompeii, and especially has passed along the streets situated immediately to the north of the great Palestra, or else, in the second decennium of the present century, had visited the "New Excavations" of the Strada dell' Abbondanza, in the fresh state in which they had been revealed by the excavators—no one of these fortunate visitors will soon forget the impression produced by the number of notices, painted in bright colors and in the most perfect calligraphic technique upon the stucco surfaces of the walls of houses and shops. There is no need of detailed and learned argument to convince these eye-witnesses that such inscriptions, so fresh in appearance and so obviously forming an essential element in the life of the city during the period immediately preceding the final catastrophe of the year 79 of our era, are to be dated, in general, within the comparatively restricted limits thus indicated.

This impression, moreover, conforms with the general picture of local conditions which has been established with severely scientific method by Maiuri, in his recent work, *L'ultima fase*

*edilizia di Pompei*,<sup>1</sup> in which Pompeii appears as a city recovering from extensive damage caused by earthquake.

The notices in question consist chiefly of electoral propaganda; while a relatively small minority, including, however, the examples which are most conspicuous by reason of the occasional use of decorative, extra-large letters, and also of their greater length, give notice of various celebrations to be held in the city, whether at the amphitheater or elsewhere. The two categories of inscriptions are in a sense interrelated: in some instances the same individual appears in inscriptions of both classes, first as candidate for local office and then as giver of games; and in at least one clearly defined group (see below), examples of both classes of notice are signed by the same *dealbator*.

Certain historical considerations also tend to restrict the limits of time available in this connection. As a consequence of the disastrous fight between Pompeians and Nucerines in the year 59, reported by Tacitus,<sup>2</sup> the Pompeians were forbidden for the space of ten years to hold such spectacles; and although a learned colleague<sup>3</sup> has thought that an abrogation of this sentence is implied by certain graffiti, still it must be admitted, given the form in which the statement of Tacitus is couched, that for a period of some duration, beginning in the year 59, gladiatorial exhibitions were not held in the colony. The *munera* announced upon the walls cannot be assigned to the period antedating the famous fight of the year 59, for the reason above presented: the twenty years that lapsed between that year and the final catastrophe of 79 would have brought with them the deterioration or obliteration of the notices from that period, even without the effects of the disastrous earthquake of the year 62.<sup>4</sup> The notices in question are to be assigned, at least in general, to the final decade of the life of Pompeii, i. e. to the years 69-79, always with the possibility that the above-mentioned prohibition may have been removed, through the personal intervention of Nero, before

<sup>1</sup> E. g., p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> *Ann.*, XIV, 17.

<sup>3</sup> Magaldi, *Rivista di Studi Pompeiani*, II (1936), pp. 82-100, using especially *C. I. L.*, IV, 1074, 1190, 1745, 2993 y, 3525.

<sup>4</sup> This dating is to be preferred to A. D. 63, since the text of Seneca, *N. Q.*, VI, 1, 1-2, was open to interpolation, whereas Tacitus, *Ann.*, XV, 22, is imbedded firmly in an account of events of A. D. 62—in a group of sinister happenings assembled before passing on to the following year. See S. Chabert, in *Mélanges Boissier* (1903), pp. 115-19.



the year 68, and in consequence, that some of the notices may have been painted towards the close of that prince's reign: in fact, there are several allusions among the painted inscriptions to his benefactions and his popularity.<sup>5</sup>

A second consideration, restricting the time available, derives from the severe earthquake of the year 62, which has already been mentioned together with Maiuri's demonstration of the extent and nature of the damage which it caused. The fresh appearance of whole quarters of the city, when newly excavated, is largely due to the thorough reconstruction, re-stuccoing and repainting, necessitated by that disaster. Inscriptions painted on exposed stucco-faced walls antedating A. D. 62 had a poor chance of surviving intact; a still poorer chance, when, as was usual, the surface to receive them had been prepared by *dealbatio*, for this painted field itself would flake.

If these obvious criteria have not yet become a matter of common acceptance among Pompeian students, this has lain inherent in the slow progress of Pompeian studies in general, during the two centuries and more which have elapsed since the beginning of systematic excavations at that spot: just as was the case with the structures of the house-walls and the painted decorations of their interiors, so for the painted inscriptions the patient labor of successive generations of investigators has been required in order to establish precise standards of judgment and to accustom the eye of the observer to distinguish between styles and periods.

It is necessary, however, to use discretion and to judge each individual case on its own merits. It is true that a certain number of painted inscriptions survived in conditions of legibility on the walls of the houses at Pompeii even from the time of the Roman Republic; and the well-known group of "EITUNS inscriptions" are dated in the period of the Social Wars; but such inscriptions belong, technically, in a category distinct from those with which we are here concerned: they were painted, not on a surface of stucco, but directly upon the stone, or at most, on a painted surface of the stone; then, at least in certain cases, they were in turn covered by other layers either of paint or of stucco: the conditions governing their possibility of preservation

<sup>5</sup> Magaldi, *loc. cit.*

and survival were fundamentally different from those of the later *programmata*.<sup>6</sup>

Another source of error lay in the assumption that the use of a magisterial or priestly title was confined to the actual period of holding of the office or function in question—the failure to realize that a former holder could continue to avail himself of the title after his actual term of office had expired, at least in certain circumstances—as in the inscription of Agrippa on the Pantheon in Rome—and in particular in the case of a priestly office qualified as “perpetual.” Of this matter, more anon.

But it almost seems as if a malignant star had presided over these studies: for the whole discussion has been prejudiced from a source which should have been above reproach or suspicion, namely *C. I. L.*

On *C. I. L.*, IV, 3884, Mau had made the faulty deduction from the title of D. Lucretius Satrius Valens, *flamen Neronis Caesaris Aug. filii perpetuus*: “Programma igitur scriptum est inter annos p. Chr. 50 et 54”; and his general conclusions on the dating of such inscriptions were presented in *C. I. L.*, IV, Suppl. ii, p. 468: “Multum abest ut candidatorum programmata secundum tempora in ordinem redigi possint.—Nonnullos tamen candidatos—antiquiores esse affirmare licet.—Hi igitur omnes anno certe 63 anteriores sunt.”<sup>7</sup> Here most of his conclusions depend upon the dating of the flamine of D. Lucretius Satrius Valens, with which is bound up the dating of the activity of the

<sup>6</sup> E.g., *C. I. L.*, IV, 152, “on the great and antique stones” of the Casa del Naviglio: MARIVM AED. The force of these considerations is not essentially weakened by the circumstance that some notices painted on stucco were protected through being situated in roofed and sheltered places.

<sup>7</sup> Here the *C. I. L.*'s list of references bristles with errors due to incomplete revision: for 3460 thrice read 3461; for 3816 read 3820; for 3879 read 3884; for 3462 read 3463; for 3592 read 3594; for 3593 read 3595; for 3772 read 3775; for 3571 read 3572; for 3561 read 3562; for 3533 read 3534.

For D. Lucretius Satrius Valens, see e.g. *C. I. L.*, IV, 1185; 3884 = *I. L. S.*, 5145 = Diehl, 242; Diehl<sup>2</sup>, 979 a; *N. S.*, 1936, pp. 318-319, no. 97; p. 327, no. 161 (defective); Magaldi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 89-91, 134-35; *C. I. L.*, IV, 1084 (corrected, p. 202). This last inscription is, of course, to be read:—*munifico August(ali) et liberis* (i.e. to Satrius and his sons): the notice was misunderstood by Magaldi, *ibid.*, pp. 202-203 and by Diehl, no. 83.

*dealbator* Publius Aemilius Celer, who signed not only this notice but several others in a characteristic technique.

Both Della Corte<sup>8</sup> and Magaldi<sup>9</sup> have demonstrated the wealth of allusions to Publius Aemilius Celer among the wall-inscriptions, both painted and incised: but, perhaps because still under the influence of the conclusions set forth magisterially by Mau, they did not draw the obvious deduction regarding the late period of the *dealbator's* activities. He left sufficient evidence of his occupancy of a certain establishment to prove that they centred about the latest period of the life of the community. And yet Magaldi<sup>10</sup> had hovered on the verge of the solution, when he recognized the true character of a perpetual flamine: "può essere ormai un titolo onorifico derivante dalla carica ricoperta per il passato, non deve necessariamente indicare un ufficio tenuto attualmente."

Another painted inscription, *C. I. L.*, IV, 3572 = *I. L. S.*, 6400, of the candidate L. Rusticelius Celer, should now be reconsidered in the light of Maiuri's interpretation of the successive phases of the structure of the House of the Vettii:<sup>11</sup> it may well have been executed after the earthquake but earlier than the final restoration of that house.

To return to the nature of a perpetual flamine: the priesthood was annual but the title was perpetual. This has long been known to specialists. Toutain<sup>12</sup> had said: "Nous pensons avec Mommsen que de telles expressions désignent la permanence du titre plutôt que celle de la fonction sacerdotale elle-même.—Les *flamines perpetui* étaient dans chaque ville les prêtres honoraires du culte impérial." And, at least with regard to the African inscriptions, this has been demonstrated with an approach to certainty by F. Geiger:<sup>13</sup> "Flamines perpetui et flaminicae perpetuae ad cultum vivi principis domusque eius spectantes sunt sacerdotes annui. Sed dignitatem eique adhaerentia insignia in

<sup>8</sup> *Case e Abitanti*, no. 218.

<sup>9</sup> *Accad. Nap., Atti*, N. S., XI (1928), parte ii, pp. 55-60.

<sup>10</sup> *Riv. Stud. Pomp.*, II (1936), p. 95.

<sup>11</sup> *L'ultima fase*, pp. 105-112; also Van Buren, *M. A. A. R.*, X (1932), p. 27, pl. 5, fig. 2.

<sup>12</sup> *Les cultes païens dans l'empire romain*, prém. partie, I, p. 155.

<sup>13</sup> *De sacerdotibus Augustorum municipalibus* (*Diss. Philol. Halenses*, XXIII), pp. 45-56, especially p. 50.

perpetuum eos possedissee itaque perpetuos nominatos esse verisimillimum est."

Nor can it be asserted that the memory of Nero was so offensive at Pompeii as to preclude such use of his name after the accession of the Flavii. The above-cited inscriptions (note 3) were motivated by some act of generosity on his part or attest his popularity in general; and the official policy of denigration of his memory was not actively pursued in the earlier years of the Flavians.

Further confusion has been caused by the unwarranted deduction that games announced in the *programmata* can be associated with the magistracies held by signatories to the documents of L. Caecilius Jucundus. Here there are three sources of possible error: the magisterial title may refer to an office previously held, a magistracy, especially the highly-prized five-year ones, might be assumed for the second time, and a prosperous and generously-minded citizen might be disposed to offer games or other benefactions even when out of office and not appearing as a candidate.<sup>14</sup>

The above will perhaps suffice as the prelude to an attempt to arrange in chronological order the evidence relating to Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius, to reconstruct his career within the limits consented by the evidence, and to determine the nature of two of his benefactions.

The presence in duplicate of the name *Cn. Alleius* in a graffito<sup>15</sup> affords no positive information for our purpose.

A painted notice—painted directly on a pilaster, without the use of stucco, and hence capable of longer preservation<sup>16</sup>—*Maium aed. ovf.*, reveals him at an early stage of his career, as candidate for the local aedileship.

<sup>14</sup> As will be shown below, this renders intelligible the number of different games offered by Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius; also his popularity attested by *C. I. L.*, IV, 1177: *Maio / principi coloniae / feliciter*; *N. S.*, 1939, p. 309, fig. 22; p. 311, no. 423: *Celer lorarius Maio delibat. / Maio principi coloniae felic(iter)*; and *N. S.*, 1936, pp. 340-1, no. 219: *Cn. Alleio Maio / principi munerarior(um) / feliciter*. The fact is so obvious that it has escaped the attention of both Zangemeister, *C. I. L.*, IV, p. 71, and Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V, pp. 100-101.

<sup>15</sup> *C. I. L.*, IV, 1483.

<sup>16</sup> *C. I. L.*, IV, 512.

Another<sup>17</sup> shows him aiming for a more exalted rank in the quattuorvirate: [Cn. Alle]ium Maium d. v. i. d. / Aurelius civem bonum fac(it).

The electoral campaign which was to result in a still higher position is revealed by the notice, transmitted to us in a faulty copy:<sup>18</sup> M. ALVIVM (leg. CN. ALLEIVM) D. V. I. D. / Q. O. V. F. / —S. ONOMASTVS. ROGAT.

So far, no fixed dates: but one is now furnished by certain *tabulae ceratae* of L. Caecilius Jucundus—*apochae*—dated in A. D. 55/6, in which our magistrate appears once as d. v. i. d. quinq. of that year; once as creditor; a third *apocha*, lacking date, mentions him as witness.<sup>19</sup> His *duumviratus quinq.* then occurred in that year, A. D. 55/6.<sup>20</sup>

On the other hand, the well-known renting notice<sup>21</sup> implies a date not far from the great catastrophe of Vesuvius: for the reason that such a notice would not have been left intact after it had once served its purpose, on the outside wall of a dignified residence or of a series of shops. Besides, four *tabernae* forming part of the house in question, "entirely reconstructed after the earthquake" of the year 62, were not "yet fitted out for rental and for commercial use at the moment of the eruption."<sup>22</sup> For these reasons, this renting notice appears to attest the survival of Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius down to the last years of Pompeii, some twenty-four years after he had attained the *duumviratus quinquennalis*: if he was, e. g., forty years old when he held that office, he need not have passed sixty-four at the time of the catastrophe.

It is to this latest period of his life that his well-known *edicta*

<sup>17</sup> C. I. L., IV, 499: on a pilaster: some of the others were painted "in lateribus dealbatis." This helps to explain their preservation.

<sup>18</sup> C. I. L., IV, 504: on a pilaster.

<sup>19</sup> C. I. L., IV, suppl. i, nos. CXLVIII, 4-5, 15-16; XVI, 1-2, 15, 19; LXXVII, 5.

<sup>20</sup> He could have retained the title after the expiration of his term of office or between two terms of office; but in the tablet first cited his magistracy serves for dating.

<sup>21</sup> C. I. L., IV, 138 = I. L. S., 6035 = Diehl, 437: *insula Arriana / Polliana [C]n. Al[le]i Nigidi Mai / locantur ex [?] Iulis primis tabernae / cum pergulis suis et c[e]nacula / equestria et domus. conductor / convenito Primum [C]n. Al[le]i / Nigidi Mai ser(vum)*. Here he appears as a speculative holder of real estate.

<sup>22</sup> Maiuri, *op. cit.*, p. 100.



*munerum edendorum* are to be assigned, for reasons already set forth in treating of such notices in general; and it is to these exceptional documents that our attention must now be directed. No less than four sets of *ludi* are attested by the notices of this generous personage: itself a strong confirmation of the view, expressed above, that such exhibitions were not necessarily limited to those imposed by the requirements of office or the necessities of electoral campaigning.

One notice <sup>23</sup> mentions thirty pairs of gladiators, and the name of the *dator* is followed by the qualification of *quinquennalis* and then the acclamation: *Maio quinq. feliciter!*

He appears again with the title of *quinquennalis* in a notice found on the Strada dell' Abbondanza: <sup>24</sup>—*sine impensa publica glad. par. XX et eorum supp(ositicii) pugn. Pompeis.*

Greater importance, however, is assumed by a third notice of games, which requires more detailed attention, especially in view of its defective state as transmitted to us: <sup>25</sup>

*Pro salute—Caesaris Augu[sti] li[b]e[ro]rumqu[e]—dedicationem arae [fam. gladiat.] Cn. [All]ei Nigidi Mai flami—Caesaris Augusti pugn. Pompeis sine ulla dilatione IIII non. Iul. venatio [sparsiones] vela erunt.*

Here the reference is without doubt to the Flavian house: a parallel is supplied by the well known stone from the Roman Forum: <sup>26</sup> *Paci aeternae / domus / imp. Vespasiani / Caesaris Aug. / liberorumq. eius / sacrum—*. In our opinion the notice not only may but must be restored as follows:

#### PRO. SALVTE

[imp. Vespasiani] CAESARIS. AVGV[sti] LI[b]E[ro]RUM-  
QV[e]

[eius ob] DEDICATIONEM. ARAE [fam. gladiat.] CN.

[All]EI. NIGIDI. MAI

FLAMI[nis] CAESARIS. AVGVSTI. PVGN. POMPEIS, etc.

The *flamen Caesaris Augusti*, naturally, was the flamen of the ruling emperor, in this case Vespasian. <sup>27</sup> The construction [ob]

<sup>23</sup> C. I. L., IV, 1179 = I. L. S., 5143 = Diehl, 243.

<sup>24</sup> N. S., 1913, 479 = Diehl<sup>2</sup>, 980.

<sup>25</sup> C. I. L., IV, 1180; add. pp. 462, 790 = Diehl, 245.

<sup>26</sup> I. L. S., 6049.

<sup>27</sup> Pace of previous scholars: e.g. Magaldi, *Riv. Stud. Pomp.*, II (1936), pp. 187-88, 202, refers it to the period of Claudius. It is tempting to group with this the "eco abbreviata" *pro sal. / gladiatorum paria XX / pugnab.*, N. S., 1946, p. 95, no. 78 bis.

*dedicationem* suggests that the *ludi* were presented not before the altar but presumably in the amphitheater.

The *ara*, the dedication of which was to be celebrated by means of these gladiatorial exhibitions, could hardly have been other than the well-preserved altar with marble veneering, the abundant sculptured decoration of which includes not only a scene of sacrifice but the sacerdotal insignia, *corona civica* and laurel branches, which occur on coins of Vespasian: the altar familiar to all visitors to Pompeii, which stands in the forecourt of the temple which, on the basis of this inscription, may now with perfect confidence keep the name of "the temple of Vespasian."<sup>28</sup>

As has already been mentioned, and as has been clearly revealed and documented in Maiuri's *Ultima fase* cited above, with the tremendous earthquake of A. D. 62 a new period in the life of Pompeii began, characterized by a feverish activity in the restoration or fresh construction of, first private buildings of a commercial nature, then residential quarters for the poorer classes, and finally some of the public buildings. The last-named class includes the temple and altar of Vespasian, as we have just seen: and here too seems to belong another structure which is mentioned in a painted announcement discovered on the north side of the Strada dell' Abbondanza:<sup>29</sup>

#### DEDICATIONE

OPERIS. TABVLARVM. GN. ALLEI. MAI. POMPEIS.  
IDIBVS. IVNIS

POMPA. VENATIO. ATHLETAE [sparsiones] VÉLA.  
ERVNT

(We omit the names *Ocella* and *Nigra va(le)*, as non-essential to our purpose.)

No fewer than three, and possibly four, certain or probable variants of the same notice of games—incomplete however—have

<sup>28</sup> Maiuri, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-48; Bowerman, *Roman Sacrificial Altars*, pp. 75, 90; Brendel, *Rom. Mitt.*, XLV (1930), pp. 200-1, pl. 68; N. Degrassi, *Bull. Com.*, LXVII (1939), p. 73. Not the altar of the "Sacellum Larum Publicorum," the dedication of which would have been combined with that of the building in the center of which it stood: Fiorelli, *Descr.*, p. 263; *C. I. L.*, IV, p. 462; Maiuri, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-53.

<sup>29</sup> *N. S.*, 1914, pp. 106-7; *I. L. S.*, add. p. clxxxiv, no. 5144; Diehl<sup>2</sup>, 981.

come to light in various quarters of Pompeii;<sup>30</sup> in the first of these, there is preserved the word *sparsiones*, which is not legible in the copy reproduced above, presumably because it was executed in a special color which has not resisted the action of atmospheric agencies.

Here, the personal name used in the genitive, Cn. Allei Nigidi Mai, seems to depend on all three words preceding, *dedicatione operis tabularum*; although it might be taken as referring simply to *operis tabularum*.

It appears necessary to reject the interpretation of *opus tabularum* as = *tabularium*, "record-office," and still more the identification with the building at the south end of the Forum currently known as *curia*:<sup>31</sup> *opus tabularum* is a periphrasis for *tabulae*,<sup>32</sup> and for its interpretation it will suffice to cite the Elder Pliny's description<sup>33</sup> of the famous theater of Scaurus in Rome: *ima pars scaenae e marmore fuit, media e vitro,—summa e tabulis inauratis—reliquus apparatus tantus Attalica veste, tabulis pictis, cetero choragio fuit.*

The *tabulae*, then, whether gilded or painted or otherwise treated, formed the decorative background of the stage, or its details, decorative, subsidiary, or technical. Or else they may have been the platforms which served as sounding-boards: Vitruvius, V, 5, attests a preoccupation with acoustics, but the *tabulationes* of wooden theaters there mentioned are not apposite in the present connection.

The structural remains of the great theater of Pompeii show that the decorative portion of the *scena* was undergoing modernisation during the latest period of the life of the colony:<sup>34</sup> it is to this adornment that the notice of games is to be referred.

As regards the details of these games mentioned in the notice: *pompa*, *sparsiones*, and *vela* require no comment; they fit in

<sup>30</sup> *C. I. L.*, IV, 1177 = *I. L. S.*, 5144 = Diehl, 244; 1178; 3883; *N. S.*, 1913, p. 85, no. 11.

<sup>31</sup> Della Corte, *loc. cit.* in *N. S.*, 1914; Maiuri, *op. cit.*, p. 37; *N. S.*, 1942, pp. 284-85. For *tabularium*: Vergil, *Georg.*, II, 502; *I. L. S.*, III, pp. 901-2; Diehl, *Altlat. Inschr.*<sup>3</sup>, nos. 379-380.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *R.-E.*, s. v. "opus"; *I. L. S.*, 9362, *opus bibliothecae*.

<sup>33</sup> *N. H.*, XXXVI, 114-115. Theatrical scenery was treated by A. M. Friend, Jr., in *Art Studies*, VII (1929), pp. 9-22; *pinakes* = *tabulae* in one sense, p. 20.

<sup>34</sup> Maiuri, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-80.

naturally with any exhibition in an open-air theater. The mention however of *athletae*, and still more *venatio*, seems to us at first sight to be more suitable for an amphitheater than for a theater; there are, however, precedents: Cicero, in his famous Letter to Marius,<sup>35</sup> and Plutarch, in his *Life of Pompey*,<sup>36</sup> describe the gymnastic exhibitions and the wild-beast shows which were offered by Pompey on the occasion of the inauguration of his theater in Rome.

This notice, therefore, transmitted in four or possibly five copies, forms a document of prime importance for the history of the great open-air theater of Pompeii: an edifice, the stage structure of which was being embellished during the last years of the colony's existence,<sup>37</sup> and the re-dedication of which—even assuming that the projected reconstruction had not been brought to completion—would have afforded adequate occasion for spectacles such as the notice indicates.

As all know, the history of the *scena* of this theater in its successive phases is far from simple, and the opinions of learned colleagues have been by no means in agreement.<sup>38</sup> Maiuri, however, concludes that during that final period, that is to say after the great earthquake, the structure of the *scena* had been entirely remade in brickwork, with an architectural composition approaching the broken architectures of the Neronian and early Flavian time, but that not even the architectural decoration of the *scena* was entirely completed at the moment of the eruption of 79, since there is lacking every trace of columns, trabeation, and sculpture. This would not have prevented an "inauguration" in the unfinished state, to satisfy the demands of an impatient public which expected not only bread but games.

In the well-known account of the final catastrophe presented by Dio Cassius<sup>39</sup> we read that the eruption occurred "while the people of the city were seated in the theater." Some have seen in this statement a reference to the amphitheater. Now, however, on the basis of the above considerations, Dio's statement may be accepted literally: the theater was at that time capable of accommodating at least a certain number of spectators, and of functioning at least to some extent.

<sup>35</sup> *Ad Fam.*, VII, 1.

<sup>36</sup> LII, 4.

<sup>37</sup> Maiuri, *loc. cit.*

<sup>38</sup> M. Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater*, pp. 336-38.

<sup>39</sup> LXVI, 23, 3.

At the time that the structural remains in question were discovered, "vi si sono rinvenuti più frammenti delle aste che sostenevano il sipario."<sup>40</sup> If so, how is it possible that no remains were observed of such a structure or structural details in wood as have been envisaged in the present discussion?

The answer is not difficult: in the first place, the excavations in question took place in the years 1764-65 and 1791-96, that is to say in an age when the excavators did not give such attention as would now be usual to the vestiges of elements which, for them, seemed to possess only a secondary interest. Moreover, as in the case of the bronze statues which once formed the adornment and the distinction of the Forum and also of the so-called Foro Triangolare, we are here following in the track of the *curatores restituendae Campaniae* mentioned by Suetonius:<sup>41</sup> it would have been a special function of that commission to recover valuable and usable objects, especially those in public places, for the purpose of re-use elsewhere. And one of the very first of the public edifices to which these functionaries would have directed their attention would have been the great theater: its huge dimensions, together with the characteristic semi-circular outline of the *cavea*, situated as it was on the slope of the hillside, made its identification extremely easy. In fact, given the considerable elevation reached by such *scaenarum frontes*, it is certain that even after the rain of *lapilli* and *cineres*, the upper portions of the *opus tabularum* projected conspicuously above the level of the ground: to have left in place the *opus tabularum* of Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius would have constituted an act of culpable negligence on the part of the *curatores restituendae Campaniae*.

A. W. VAN BUREN.

AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME.

<sup>40</sup> Fiorelli, *Pomp. Ant. Hist.*, I, ii, p. 51.

<sup>41</sup> *Titus*, 8, 4.



## CATULLUS' *ATTIS*.

Though most students of Catullus and of Latin poetry in general speak of the *Attis* in superlative terms, few have seriously attempted to treat this poem as original poetry.<sup>1</sup> Its fate too often has been: *laudatur et alget*. Possibly this neglect has arisen from the backing which Wilamowitz gave to the unsupportable suggestion that in this work Catullus was translating or closely imitating an imaginary Alexandrian prototype.<sup>2</sup> At all events, in evaluations of Catullus' imaginative powers and of his formal creative talents,<sup>3</sup> the poem is usually passed by with a few stock compliments, and most of the comments on it are confined to matters of text, grammar, or the Cybele-Attis cult.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Two notable exceptions are G. Allen, *The Attis of Caius Valerius Catullus* (London, 1892), and W. Y. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of the Republic* (3rd ed., 1905), pp. 461-62. Considerable help, too, in this line may be had from G. Friedrich, *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Teubner, 1908), pp. 295-314.

<sup>2</sup> Wilamowitz, "Die Galliamben des Kallimachos und Catullus," *Hermes*, XIV (1879), pp. 194-99, conjectured that in his *Attis* Catullus was translating a poem by Callimachus of which two lines, he claimed (following the suggestion of O. Schneider, *Callimachea*, II [Teubner, 1873], p. 698), are still preserved by Hephaestion. In his "*Attis*," *Hellenistische Dichtung* (Berlin, 1924), pp. 291-95, Wilamowitz modified his earlier view to allow as Catullian the middle of the poem. The evidence, if it may be called that, is this: Hephaestion, 12 (ed. M. Consbruch [Teubner, 1905], p. 38), describing the development of the galliambic metre from Ionic tetrameter catalectic, remarks that the metre is also called *μητρῴακόν* because the "newer" poets had used it when writing of the Great Mother. To illustrate the metre, he cites without mention of author two "famous" galliambic lines, neither of which mentions Attis. The scholiast on this passage (Consbruch, *op. cit.*, p. 246) says that "Callimachus also used this metre." Any attempt to link the poem to other possible Alexandrian models is equally unsupportable.

<sup>3</sup> It is regrettable that A. L. Wheeler in his excellent *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry* (Berkeley, 1934) omitted a study of this poem. Little help is to be found in G. Lafaye, *Catulle et ses Modèles* (Paris, 1894), pp. 82-89 since he followed Wilamowitz so closely.

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that Catullus is much more interested in this poem in the rites of the cult than in the forms of the myth. On myth and cult, see H. Hepding, *Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult* (Giessen, 1903); H. Graillet, *Le Culte de Cybèle* (Paris, 1912), especially pp.

Such points surely merit the most careful study. Yet the work possesses many of the qualities which are commonly associated with great poetry; it is an exact and intense expression of a significant and moving theme, put in a form of high technical excellence. A study of the ideas and construction of the poem, therefore, would certainly appear to be merited.

This paper is directed toward such a study, and aims to suggest answers to three of the basic questions which should be asked about the poem. What idea or concept was the poet seeking to express in the work? Why did such an idea appeal to him? And with what technical and formal devices did he seek to express that idea? In such a subjective field, it need hardly be said, one cannot pretend to any dogmatism.

First, what was Catullus' aim in this poem? As I interpret the work, it is the dramatization of a mental state or, to put it another way, the sympathetic delineation of a mind undergoing a psychological experience of a most powerful sort. And Catullus' Attis, in my opinion, is not the original Attis of the myth but an ordinary man who by emasculation becomes a priest of Cybele. The poem presents a study of two moods of such a man. The first is one of wild and dominant fanaticism which culminates in a terrible self-sacrifice; the second is one of awakening and bleak despair when Attis realizes what he has done, what he now is, and recalls the world to which he may never now return. In brief, it is a study of fanatic devotion and subsequent disillusionment.

Why did such a study appeal to Catullus? I should say at once that I share Professor Havelock's distaste<sup>5</sup> for the school of literary criticism which, relying on those weary handmaids, history and psychology, believes that a poet's verses are best understood against a factual background of biography. Not only may such a "literal" approach inhibit our critical appreciation of the poet's imaginative powers and of the extent to which his own virtuosity is dictator, but, in many cases, the biographical "facts" are not facts at all, but simply conjectural cobwebs.<sup>6</sup>

101-3; F. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le Paganisme romain* (Paris, 1929), pp. 43-68. I am indebted to Mrs. Milton Ryberg for much suggestive information on this cult.

<sup>5</sup> E. A. Havelock, *The Lyric Genius of Catullus* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 79-85.

<sup>6</sup> Thus, if one were to suggest that both Attis and Catullus through

Thus in the case of the *Attis* we can safely enough assume that Catullus had witnessed the rites of Attis in Bithynia (in 57-56?) and probably marvelled at a power which moved the frenzied worshippers *Veneris nimio odio* to such limits. Emasculation is obviously a subject full of attraction and horror for all human beings.<sup>7</sup> Certainly, too, like many educated Romans of his day Catullus must have watched with keen interest the worship of the Great Mother in Rome itself,<sup>8</sup> though, like Lucretius, Caecilius, Varro, or Maecenas, he could safely express this interest only in a literary way. Such personal observation may well explain the poet's original curiosity about this strange and bizarre cult and account for his knowledge of its rites. It is quite another matter, however, to explain why he chose to picture with such vivid contrast the high enthusiasm and the deep disillusionment of a human being who entered into this inhuman practice. The sympathetic reconstruction of poetic impulses is ticklish business; fortunately, it may not be a business of any great moment. But one element in the composition of the *Attis* we should not overlook—the poet's desire to indulge his own virtuosity. Surely the poet who could often express the most passionate thoughts in the calmness of high art was fully aware of the opportunities which such a subject offered his artistic talents. The chances for such a display in such a work undoubtedly attracted him to the theme. One cannot successfully probe too deeply into the distinction of form from content, but some aspects of formal excellence, in their subtle union with content, merit attention. In the *Attis* this is particularly true of those formal devices by which the poet created the effect of wild orgiastic speed and those by which he helps to convey the unforgettable picture of Attis' two states of mind. To a study of these technical devices we shall now turn.

To account for the speed and orgiastic abandon which stamp

an unworthy form of devotion had unfitted themselves for any other love, and that consequently this theme appealed to Catullus, not only may he actually be underrating the poet's artistic imagination by such a "literal" circumscription, but he has arbitrarily dated the composition of the poem on no evidence at all.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. S. Freud, *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis* (transl. W. Sprott, New York, 1933), pp. 122-3 and 170.

<sup>8</sup> See Grailiot, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-107.

the poem, one should first turn to the metre itself.<sup>9</sup> The preponderant number of short syllables, especially in the last half of the line, lends to the poem the air of swiftness which matches the quick enthusiasm of the worshippers, while the imperious caesura, preceded with striking contrast by the insistent long syllables, furnishes the fateful and heavy regularity of the tympana themselves. This orgiastic effect is heightened by the careful use of alliteration<sup>10</sup> and assonance, as in the line

tympanum, tubam Cybelles, tua, mater, initia (9)

or in

dea, magna dea, Cybelle, dea, domina Dindimeï (91).

The atmosphere of wild speed is also built up in other ways. The short cola and asyndeton are effective; so, too, are the great number of verbs of motion. The same purpose seems to have governed the poet's choice of adjectives. One is reminded of Southey's assonant participles in his description of the fall of the water at Lodore. Most of Catullus' adjectives either depict haste, like *celer*, *citatus*, and *rapidus*, or else frenzy, like *vagus*,<sup>11</sup> *ravidus*, and *furibundus*.

When we pass to an examination of the technical ways by which the poet helped convey his impressive picture of Attis' two moods, a number of points need attention. First, the struc-

<sup>9</sup> We do not know whether the galliambic metre was an Alexandrian invention, though most scholars assume that it was; cf., however, R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus* (2nd ed., 1889), p. 252, n. 1. The only ancient galliambics known, beside those quoted by Hephaestion (see note 2) are: four fragments by Varro (E. Bolisani, *Varrone Menippeo* [Padova, 1936], frags. 80, 142, 143, 288), two by Maecenas (W. Morel, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* [Teubner, 1927], p. 102), and one by an unknown author (Morel, *op. cit.*, p. 174). On the metre itself, see G. Allen, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-54; R. Tyrrell, "Grant Allen on the Attis of Catullus," *C. R.*, VII (1893), pp. 44-5; E. Thompson and G. Dunn, "The Galliambic Metre," *C. R.*, VII (1893), pp. 145-8; E. Thomas, "Attin annotavit illustravit, anglice reddidit Grant Allen," *Rev. Crit.* (nouvelle série), XXXV (1893), pp. 284-6; T. Goodell, "Word-accent in Catullus's Galliambics," *T. A. P. A.*, XXXIV (1903), pp. 27-32.

<sup>10</sup> For some interesting views on the effect of recurrent sounds, see J. L. Lowes, *Convention and Revolt in Poetry* (Boston, 1919), pp. 243 ff., and D. A. Stauffer, *The Nature of Poetry* (New York, 1946), pp. 88-9.

<sup>11</sup> *Vagus* in line 4 depicts frenzy; in lines 13, 25, 31, 86, motion.

ture of the poem is noteworthy. Narrative is kept to a minimum. The sudden opening reminds one of the *Shield of Heracles* or of some of Theocritus' shorter idylls or epyllia<sup>12</sup> or of Callimachus' *Hecale* or *Bath of Pallas*. Description, used with great economy and usually for dramatic purposes, is confined to such key elements as the savage sea over which the "mad crew were borne," the furious enthusiasm of the devotees as they ascend Mount Ida, the frozen wastes of Cybele's dark realm, and the golden beauty of the sunrise that restores consciousness to the worshippers. The description of Attis himself, as he was and as he became, serves but to emphasize the dramatic contrast. For once he was "the flower of the gymnasium, the glory of the wrestler's ring, whose threshold was warmed with many visitors, whose home was garlanded with fair wreaths."<sup>13</sup> This general picture, thoroughly Greek, was enough; no individualization was wanted here, for this is the picture of any man become Attis. Then we see the new Attis, the now *notha mulier*, sketched with the fewest of strokes—*niveis manibus, teneris digitis, roseis labellis, tenerum Attin*. As for his companions, abruptly introduced in Hellenistic fashion in line 11 and forgotten before the poem's close, they merit no description at all. So, too, similes are few and functional. Of the three, *velut exules* (line 14) bears an ironical reference to lines 59 and 60; the other two, in lines 33 and 51, imply eventual mastery and enslavement under Cybele. From the structural point of view, the chief emphasis is given to the speeches, so that against the lightly drawn background described above we may focus all our attention upon Attis' own feelings and moods. And the two speeches, reflecting the two moods of devotion and of despair, are thrown into a sharp contrast by the sudden and delicate beauty of the verses on the sunrise:

sed ubi oris aurei Sol radiantibus oculis  
lustravit aethera album, sola dura, mare ferum,  
pepulitque noctis umbras vegetis sonipedibus (39 ff.).

This is a contrast which not only intensifies each separate mood but also fuses them into a total picture of great power. Such

<sup>12</sup> Nos. 6, 8, 24, 25.

<sup>13</sup> Lines 64-6.



an equation of night with frenzy and of dawn with sanity is reminiscent of passages in the *Iliad* and in the *Ajax*.<sup>14</sup>

One of the poet's most interesting devices for showing us the tortured agony of the awakened Attis is the variation in the gender of Attis after the emasculation. Usually, of course, he is feminine. But now and then, in significant spots, he emerges masculine. Thus in line 45 when, freed momentarily from his madness with the coming of dawn, he reviews his own acts, he is *ipse*.<sup>15</sup> But a few lines later, when he addresses in his hopelessness his fatherland in Roman style, the word is *allocuta*. The masculine points back to his previous state; the feminine realistically depicts his present state. So in the speech itself he describes himself as masculine when he left his homeland (*quam miser relinquens*, line 51), but he acknowledges his present state elsewhere by applying feminine adjectives to himself. So, too, the goddess subtly recognizes the revolt in Attis' own mind by calling him masculine when she bids the lion drive him back into submission: *face ut hunc furor agitet* (line 78) . . . *qui fugere imperia cupit* (line 80). And in our last picture of Attis, *ille demens fugit in nemora fera* (line 89), we are left with a hint of that inner struggle which he is destined in occasional periods of sanity to feel for the rest of his life.

In his metrical variations, too, Catullus has shown great sensitivity to content. Consider, for example, lines 22 and 23 in Attis' first speech of enthusiasm:

tibicen ubi canit Phryx curvo grave calamo,  
ubi capita Maenades vi iaciunt hederigeræ.

In the first, one hears the slow music of the curved reed; in the second, one feels the orgiastic abandon of the Maenads.<sup>16</sup> Or note the utter weariness of the devotees in the close of this line:

itaque, ut domum Cybelles tetigere lassulæ (35)

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Iliad*, XXIII, 212-32, and *Ajax*, 21, 217, 258, 660, 672.

<sup>15</sup> I have followed the Oxford text of R. Ellis, *Catulli Carmina*. Friedrich, and Kroll (*C. Valerius Catullus* [Teubner, 1929]), have adopted the emendation *ipsa*, which here quite misses the point.

<sup>16</sup> Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 303, notes that the first half of lines 21-23 closes with a monosyllabic word, which thus heightens the mood of frenzy.

or the wavering, feminine, fluctuation of Attis expressed in the short syllables of:

ego mulier, ego adolescens, ego ephebus, ego puer (63).

On the whole, the first speech contains more short syllables than the second, which is what one would expect from a contrast of the thought of each. The second speech closes with a line memorable for its long syllables, by which the poet emphasizes the culmination of the emotional crisis:

iam iam dolet quod egi, iam iamque paenitet (73).

One of the most marked features of the poem is the extensive use of repetitions, a feature common, though to a less degree, to many other of Catullus' poems.<sup>17</sup> The eye has certainly largely displaced the ear in our modern literary communication, despite the radio.<sup>18</sup> But not so in Catullus' time, and we must not miss the force of pictures for the ear in a poetry written for recitation. In lines 62-71 of Attis' second speech, *ego* occurs thirteen times, an iterative device here used to reinforce the highly personal character of the speech. But more striking is

<sup>17</sup> E.g. Catullus uses the irregularly recurring refrain in several poems: In no. 61, *Virginem, o Hymenaeae Hymen, / Hymen o Hymenaeae* 4 times (with the first word wisely varied); and *Te volente. quis huic deo / comparier ausit* 3 times; and *Prodeas nova nupta* (with *abit dies* preceding in 3 cases; cf. also line 192) 5 times; and *Io Hymen Hymenaeae io, / io Hymen Hymenaeae* 11 times. In no. 62: *Hymen o Hymenaeae, Hymen ades o Hymenaeae!* 8 times. In no. 64: *currere ducentes subtegmina, currite, fusi* 13 times. In three short poems he commences and closes with the same line (nos. 16, 36, 57). Or he often suggests a theme by repeating words from another poem; cf. 2, 1 with 3, 4; 8, 5 with 37, 12; 21, 2-3 with 24, 2-3 (cf. 49, 2-3); 23, 1 with 24, 5; 41, 4 with 43, 5. And the device of repeating one or two words within the same poem in the same metrical position is surprisingly common in both his short and long works; cf. *obdura* in 8, 11 and 19 (cf. also line 12); *venisti* in 9, 3 and 5; *sive* in 11, 2 and 5 and 7 and 9; *cenabis bene* in 13, 1 and 7; *eone nomine* in 29, 11 and 23; *Sirmio* in 31, 1 and 12; *pueri integri* in 34, 2 and 3; *renidet ille* in 39, 4 and 6; *omnium* in 49, 5-7; *concubine* in 61, 125 and 128 and 130 and 133; variations of *tum Thetidis* in 64, 19-21; *-ore Theseu* in 64, 69 and 133; *-ore Theseus* in 64, 73 and 110; *Gallus* in 78, 1 and 3 and 5; *quid carius est oculis* in 82, 2 and 4; *formosa est* in 86, 1 and 5; *quid facit is* in 88, 1 and 3; cf. *niveis* . . . *artus* with *niveos* . . . *artus* in 64, 303 and 364.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Stauffer, *op. cit.*, pp. 13 ff.

the repetition of words in the *same* metrical position.<sup>19</sup> Now this is a device not at all common in earlier writers. Naturally there is some correspondence of sounds in the strophes and antistrophes of Greek choral odes;<sup>20</sup> now and then one finds such repetitions by the same character within a few lines in the three tragedians,<sup>21</sup> and some instances of repetitions in the *same* metrical position may be found in the poems of Solon,<sup>22</sup> Theocritus,<sup>23</sup> and Bion.<sup>24</sup> Several examples occur in Euripides' ode to the Great Mother in his *Helen*<sup>25</sup> and in the *Hymn to the Idaean Dactyls*.<sup>26</sup> Callimachus appears to be the poet most fond of this practice.<sup>27</sup> Still, the device is rarely found and, though one may argue that the exigencies of the galliambic metre, which is certainly contrary to the genius of the Latin language, may explain some of this repetition, the amount of it in the *Attis* is so large that it would appear to be consciously done. And this iteration in the *same* metrical position involves key words: *Attis*, *Cybele*, *citatus*, *animus*, and *nemora*. This sort of repetition is not used here for liturgical purposes, for the *Attis* is anything but a hymn, nor is the repetition mere ornamentation. Rather, its function

<sup>19</sup> As pointed out in my "The Art of Catullus' *Attis*," *T. A. P. A.*, LXXI (1940), pp. xxxiii-xxxiv. My suggestions there made on epyllion and hymnal elements in this poem now seem to me largely unsupportable. J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature* (Scribners, 1895), p. 57, noting the repetition of *identidem* in the same metrical position in 11, 19 and 51, 3 calls it "a stroke of subtle and daring art."

<sup>20</sup> E. g. *Antigone* 585 and 596, and 614 and 625.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. F. Schroeder, "De iteratis apud tragicos graecos," *Diss. Philol. Argentoratenses*, VI (1882), pp. 84-5 and 123-4.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. forms of ἄλλος in Solon, 13 (no. 1 in E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* [1936], pp. 23-29), lines 17, 29, 39, 47, 49, 51, 53, 57, 67.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. forms of Διώνυσος closing the verse in no. 26, lines 6, 9, 27, 37; Πενθεύς opens lines 10, 16, 18; χαίροι opens lines 33, 35.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. ὀλβιος ἦν in no. 8, lines 2, 4, 7.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. μάτηρ in lines 1301 and 1320, and ματρός in lines 1340 and 1356.

<sup>26</sup> *I. G.*, XII, 9, no. 259; lines 8 and 23, and 25 and 30 as edited by J. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford, 1925), pp. 171-3.

<sup>27</sup> E. g. Ζεῦ σὲ in Hymn 1, lines 6, 7, and 45; Ἀπέλλων in Hymn 2, lines 34, 42, 51, 61, 68, and 93; forms of Φοῖβος in Hymn 2, lines 44, 47, 55, and 65; forms of Ἀητῶ in Hymn 4, lines 39, 60, 68, 204, 246, and 326; Ἀστερίη in Hymn 4, lines 37, 197, 224, 225, 244, 300, and 316; Ἀθαναία in Hymn 5, lines 5, 16, 33, 43, 55, 57, 69, 88, 96, 99, 133, and 137; forms of Ἐρυσίχθων in Hymn 6, lines 32, 65, 81, and 85; forms of ἐλαίη in Iambi, lines 224, 233, 262, 266, 271, 276, and 280.

in this poem is to help convey the picture of a unique and morbid state of mind, by returning the reader forcefully and frequently to key themes.<sup>28</sup> The following cases merit attention:

super alta vectus <i>Attis</i> celeri rate maria	(1)
simul haec comitibus <i>Attis</i> cecinit notha mulier	(27)
comitata tympano <i>Attis</i> per opaca nemora dux	(32)
ibi Somnus excitum <i>Attin</i> fugiens citus abiit	(42)
simul ipse pectore <i>Attis</i> sua facta recoluit	(45)
tenerumque vidit <i>Attin</i> prope marmora pelagei	(88)
tympanum, tubam <i>Cybelles</i> , tua, mater, initia	(9)
Phrygiam ad domum <i>Cybelles</i> , Phrygia ad nemora deae	(20)
itaque, ut domum <i>Cybelles</i> tetigere lassulae	(35)
ait haec minax <i>Cybelle</i> religatque iuga manu	(84)
dea, magna dea, <i>Cybelle</i> , dea, domina Dindime	(91)
Phrygium ut nemus <i>citato</i> cupide pede tetigit <sup>29</sup>	(2)
hilarate aere <i>citatis</i> erroribus animum	(18)
quo nos decet <i>citatis</i> celerare tripudiis	(26)
ibi Somnus excitum <i>Attin</i> fugiens citus abiit	(42)
alios age <i>incitatos</i> , alios age rabidos	(93)
agite ite ad alta, Gallae, Cybeles nemora simul	(12)
famuli solent, ad Idae tetuli nemora pedem	(52)
egone a mea remota haec ferar in nemora domo	(58)
ubi cerva silvicultrix, ubi aper nemorivagus	(72)
face uti furoris ictu reditum in nemora ferat	(79)
facit impetum: ille demens fugit in nemora fera	(89)
stimulatus ibi furenti rabie, vagus animis	(4)
hilarate aere <i>citatis</i> erroribus animum	(18)

<sup>28</sup> *Attis*, *animus*, *nemora*, *redimita*, *itaque ut* and *citus abiit* could stand metrically in several other positions. Words forming a bacchius, however, like *Cybelle*, *citato* and *acuto* must stand, I admit, just before the caesura. But Catullus could have avoided this in the case of *Cybelle* by using the form *Cybele* (as he did in lines 12, 68, and 76, where it stands each time in the same metrical position). The recurrences of *Attis* were noticed by T. Means, "Catullus LXIII," *C. P.*, XXII (1927), pp. 101-2, who suggests that "The word 'Attis' (or 'Attin') finds itself in that position in the line which is as neutral as possible" to show that he was neither masculine nor feminine.

<sup>29</sup> Note that forms of *citatus* suggest also the sound *Attis*.

abit in quiete molli rabidus furor <i>animi</i>	(38)
miser a miser, querendum est etiam atque etiam, <i>anime</i>	(61)
ferus ipse sese adhortans rapidum incitat <i>animo</i>	(85)
devolvit ile <i>acuto</i> sibi pondere silicis	(5)
sectam meam <i>exsecutae</i> duce me mihi comites	(15)
ubi sacra sancta <i>acutis</i> ululatibus agitant	(24)
adiitque opaca silvis <i>redimita</i> loca deae <sup>30</sup>	(3)
mihi floridis corollis <i>redimita</i> domus erat	(66)
<i>itaque ut</i> relictis sensit sibi membra sine viro	(6)
<i>itaque, ut</i> domum Cybelles tetigere lassulae	(35)
ibi Somnus excitum Attin fugiens <i>citus abiit</i>	(42)
roseis ut huic labellis sonitus <i>citus abiit</i>	(74)
sed ubi oris aurei Sol <i>radiantibus oculis</i>	(39)
ibi maria vasta visens <i>lacrimantibus oculis</i>	(48)
abit in <i>quiete molli rabidus furor animi</i>	(38)
ita de <i>quiete molli rapida</i> sine rabie	(44)

This study has emerged from a belief that, perhaps because of Wilamowitz's support of the view that Catullus was translating Callimachus in this poem, the work as original, creative poetry has been too much neglected. Too frequently in estimates of the poet's imagination and artistic powers, the *Attis* has counted for little. Yet it deserves a better fate, and so in this paper suggestions have been advanced as to what idea, moulded from Catullus' own poetic fancy and discipline, and reflecting his personal interest, may have drawn him to this subject. Such conjectures about the psychology and art of an ancient poet, being at best chiefly subjective, are always open to criticism and correction. But the examination of the technical devices, the "tricks" of poetry, lies in a surer field, and it is to be hoped that this study of noteworthy formal elements in the *Attis* may attract the reader's attention in the case of Catullus' other poems to those devices which enabled this poet so often to recreate his feelings and experiences "in the tranquillity of a perfect art."

JOHN P. ELDER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

<sup>30</sup> Note the contrast in meaning in the two verses.



## ARISTOTLE'S PRESUPPOSITIONS ABOUT CHANGE.\*

A study of certain of Aristotle's presuppositions will reveal a basic conflict in what might be called his "protophilosophy."<sup>1</sup> That conflict lies in the existence of two orders, one of which contains material objects, change, chance, perversions, accidents, and is known only by observation, which Aristotle is unwilling to call "knowledge"; the other of which is an orderly arrangement of classes, is permanent, controlled by logical necessity, and can be known by logical insight or presumably the *nous*. Whether these two realms are existentially separate from each other is not a question which need concern us here, since the very meaning of "existentially separate" would require a detailed analysis which would be out of place. We shall call the first of these realms, the world of chance, the second the world of order, though Aristotle himself is not consistent in giving them either these names or others. Change occurs only in the former of these two realms, as does evil, and it is our purpose here to try to discover what Aristotle thought change to be.

### 1. *The Empedoclean analysis of change.*

In *Metaphysics* A, 3, 4, Aristotle assumes that in all change there can be found an agent and a patient, which are two different beings. Nothing would change "of its own accord," an axiom which continues through Renaissance science, and a problem arises only when change occurs, not when something persists "in its own nature."

We have an analogy to this in Galilean physics, when a change in direction requires explaining, the persistence of a direction requiring none. In the case of locomotion, no special difficulties arise, for it was always possible to find two distinct physical objects which came into contact with each other. In the case of

\* The paper which follows is a section from a larger study of the presuppositions of Aristotle, portions of which have already appeared in the *American Journal of Philology* at various dates. Its intentions are purely historical.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. "A Basic Conflict in Aristotle's Philosophy," *A.J.P.*, LXIV (1943), pp. 172-193.

living beings, it was not so easy to find an agent, and, as is well known, the efficient cause sometimes dwindled to a mere metaphor, the final cause taking its place. In the final analysis, the Prime Mover becomes a universal agent, and Matter a universal patient, a development which is inevitable if the analysis is universally applied.

It will be noticed that this conception of change goes back at least to Empedocles who also felt the necessity of positing agents to introduce change into the material substratum of the world.

2. *The identification of genesis with separation and combination (Met. 988 b 32).*

The Empedoclean analysis of change left open the question of what the agent actually does. Historically the two most important questions asked about its task are: (1) does the agent *create*, (2) does he simply rearrange elements already pre-existing? It would look as if Aristotle believed that real creation was impossible, for in the passage of the *Metaphysics* in which this axiom appears, he is criticizing the weakness of his predecessors in positing one element as the *arché*. If the elements are really simple, he argues, no one of them could arise out of the others. In the *De Generatione et Corruptione* (329 a 24) we see clearly that he believes the traditional elements to be compounds of the opposites *in potentia*, heat and coldness, moistness and dryness. Of these the cold and the wet are privations, so that the fundamental properties are dryness and heat, which are replaced in the transmutation of elements by their respective opposites or privations.<sup>2</sup>

This notion of qualitative change is pervasive of the corpus. All qualitative change is the passage of what might be called "floating qualities"—not unlike the qualitative atoms of Anaxagoras—from one substance into another. Thus in discussing spontaneous production (*Met. Z*, 9) Aristotle says that the heat in the movement of the masseur's hand makes heat in the body of the patient (*Met.* 1034 a 26), and in discussing the opinions of the Heracliteans he maintains that they are right in saying that the changing "when it is changing" does not exist. "For

<sup>2</sup> *Earth* is cold and dry and yet is matter in relation to *Fire* which is hot and dry.

that which is losing a quality has something of that which is being lost, and of that which is coming to be, something must already be" (*Met.* 1010 a 17). The invention of the concept of potentiality was probably made to take care of this. The thing-coming-to-be was already present in *potentia*, so that its development was simply the uncovering of the pre-existent.

Since the opposites are atomic qualities at the very least, they are elementary and indestructible. This logically led Aristotle to assert (*Met.* 1000 b 25) that to perish is to be resolved into the things from which a thing came into being. Consequently an absolutely simple thing would be eternal and, conversely, the easiest way to explain the eternality of anything was to assert its simplicity (*Met.* 1088 b 14). This is the logical reason why later thinkers who wish to prove the immortality of the soul also try, as Plato did (*Phaedo* 78), to prove its simplicity.

It is clear that Aristotle is arguing here as if he believed in the dictum *ex nihilo nihil* and indeed in *De Caelo* (302 a 3) he states definitely that though it is possible for one body to be generated out of another, it is impossible for a body to be generated "from no other pre-existing quantity." Aristotle's conception of corporeal quantity is none too clear, but Stocks translated the Greek equivalent "mass." The principle which Aristotle would be invoking is the conservation of mass, but that is anachronistic. In fact, no very clear idea of corporeal quantity obtained in physics until the time of Lavoisier. In the *Physics* (255 b 23) Aristotle speaks of the quantitative as spreading out, as if volume were the distinguishing mark of corporeal quantity, whereas in the *De Caelo* (273 a 24) weight is directly correlated with it, in the argument that an infinite body would have infinite weight. This may not be an inconsistency, inasmuch as he may mean by an infinite body a body of infinite extent. In the *Physics* (201 a 6) when he is applying the categories to the kinds of change, he indicates that the two poles of quantitative change are the complete (*teleion*) and the incomplete (*ateles*). This would seem to mean that each thing has a quantity assigned to it by "nature," and that it will increase normally until its "natural" quantity has been reached. But just what its natural quantity would be is not revealed. The principle *ex nihilo nihil*, then, cannot be said to be equivalent in Aristotle to the conservation of mass. In fact, if we may take *De Generatione et Corrup-*

*tione* (322 a 16 ff.) as typical of Aristotle's thought, "mass" would be an indefinable, just as it was in classical physics, for there he speaks of "quantity-in-general" as a basic concept referring to something which no more comes into being than "animal-in-general." "Quantity-in-general" is of course one of the categories and presumably Aristotle thought that its meaning was clear enough to require no definition.<sup>3</sup>

In any event, the characteristics of matter must be of such a nature that they cannot be observed. Matter serves a purely systematic function in the Aristotelian doctrine; it is the universal patient. We observe its qualities or properties, not itself. These qualities come together and separate and this type of behavior is what we call qualitative change. There are probably two basic metaphors at play here: (1) the metaphor of the grammatical subject with its attributes asserted in the predicate, (2) the metaphor of the receptacle, which contains things and which is unmodified by their presence or absence. The acuteness of the analysis lies in its applicability to observed fact: one can perceive the properties which come together and break apart, whether one can see the matter or not. If now Aristotle had added to his basic theory of genesis a technique for measuring observed synthesis and its reverse, he would have established a technique for empirical science. But in that event he would have had to give up the following axiom, which, while simplifying the order of nature, renders empirical science impossible.

3. *The polarity of change* (*Physics* 224 b 28; *De Gen.* 324 a 3; *Physics* A, 5, especially 188 a 31 ff.; 188 b 25; *De Anima* 416 a 33).

The best formulation of this principle occurs in *Physics* 224 b 28: "Non-accidental change is not in all things, but only in the opposites and in contradiction."

<sup>3</sup> It goes without saying that the discussion of "quantity" in *Met.* Δ, 13, the "Philosophical Lexicon," throws no light on this matter. In the same work (K, 6), discussing Protagoras, he speaks of "quantity" as "indeterminate" in nature. Ross in his commentary on this passage says, "The size of things is not definite and unchangeable as some of their qualities are." As a matter of fact, one could make out a good case for the theory that Matter as such in Aristotle amounts to little more than his system of absolute space with fixed positions; quantity thus becomes extent and is weight only in bits of matter.

This is fundamental to Aristotle's thought and is used to prove among other things that where there is no opposition, there is no change (*Physics* 225 a 10). But opposition always occurs within a given genus, so that only certain changes are possible, once the subject of the change is known, and all change is predictable. It is on this basis that one can reason out the generation of the elements from the primary qualities, which provides the logical structure of the *Meteorology*.

There is, however, one exception to this rule: locomotion. Locomotion (*Physics* 261 a 30) may be, but is not always, continuous and eternal. "Every other motion and change is from an opposite to an opposite: thus for the processes of becoming and perishing the limits are the existent and the non-existent, for alteration the various pairs of contrary affections, and for increase and decrease either greatness and smallness or perfection and imperfection of magnitude; and changes to the respective contraries are contrary changes." As Aristotle's argument develops, it turns out, as is well known, that only circular motion can be continuous and eternal (*Physics* ⑨, 8), for any rectilinear motion must come to an end, there being no infinite extent in space which it might traverse, and, if it turned back, it would, according to Aristotle, have to come to rest at the point at which it turned back. The only motion of this eternal type is that of the planets. Sublunary locomotion is never continuous and eternal and consequently it too, like other forms of change, occurs only between opposites.

In his extended analysis of change in the opening of the fifth book of the *Physics*, we find the following factors involved in any change:

1. agent
2. patient
3. time
4. *terminus a quo*
5. *terminus ad quem* <sup>4</sup>

It is the two termini which (*Physics* 224 a 34) are the poles, the opposites, the examples given by Aristotle being the hot and the cold. This means that all change except superlunary motion moves between termini which are opposites, that is, termini of

<sup>4</sup> In *Physics* 236 b 2, the number of factors is reduced to three, the patient, the time, the *terminus ad quem*.



which one is the privation of the other. Aristotle believed that there are four kinds of change: local motion (change of direction), increase and diminution (change of quantity), genesis and destruction (change of form), alteration (change of quality). But they are all forms of motion, as he says following his famous definition of motion: "the fulfillment of what exists potentially in so far as it exists, is motion" (*Physics* 201 a 10).<sup>5</sup> And motion of course takes time—in fact the definition of time implicates it within the category of motion. If Aristotle is consistent, even alteration would take time and in one place at least (*Physics* 249 a 29), he indicates that the speed of some processes of alteration is greater than that of others. Yet alteration is always the appearance and disappearance of a floating quality and like all change can occur only between opposites. Consequently alteration must be instantaneous. For the qualities are eternal and come and go as atomic blocks. In fact, when Aristotle argues against Melissus (*Physics* 186 a 15), he definitely asserts the possibility of sudden change. Genesis and destruction, being combination and separation, should also be instantaneous, for what is separated or combined can be only the atomic floating qualities in the last analysis. Increase and diminution, being change of quantity, might be expected to take time, but matter is not atomic in Aristotle, and hence cannot be supposed to grow by imperceptible amounts added one to the other over a period of time, each amount being added instantaneously. Primary matter cannot be added to or subtracted from anything. Secondary matter, the elements, can move in blocks from point to point and thus can increase and diminish the amount of matter in any given position. But there must be a minimum amount which is added in the case of increase and subtracted in the case of decrease, which would occupy the same position in Aristotle's physics as the atoms did in the physics of Democritus. These fundamental amounts would have to appear and disappear instantaneously. Now since the elements can move only in

<sup>5</sup> In *Physics* 236 b 19, he flatly asserts that all change (*to metaballon*) takes place in time, making no distinction between kinesis and other forms of change. In *Physics* 243 a 6, he makes alteration a species of motion. See also his argument against Melissus (*ibid.*, 214 a 26) in which the plenum is said to be capable of kinesis since it is capable of alteration.

predetermined directions, the appearance of a bit of, for instance, Water, on the level of Earth, could be attributable only to (1) force, some unnatural dislocation of it, or (2) its having been previously drawn down from its natural location to the earth and its present effort to regain its natural position. The former case is scientifically inexplicable, being a random event, unnatural, observable, but not knowable. The second is the realization of the bit of matter's potentiality: its coldness and wetness. Both of these qualities are unfortunately privations and privation is supposed to be unnatural. Be that as it may, what happens when some Water appears on the surface of the earth is the appearance of two floating qualities in a position in fixed space. We are back at the kind of thing that happens in alteration. Finally, the same remarks can be made about sublunary motion, all of which is realization of potentiality—the realization of the hot and dry, the hot and wet, the cold and wet, the cold and dry.

The outcome of this is that we have to recognize two physical systems in Aristotle: (1) that of fixed position, the cosmic map, so to speak, in which everything is located where it "ought" to be; (2) that of movement, in the observable world where change exists but is fundamentally inexplicable.

#### 4. *The finitude of change.*

"No change is endless but there is an end to all," *Met.* 999 b 10.

The end to a process of change is the achievement of the final cause or essence. The seed grows into a tree, fire reaches the outermost sublunary sphere, the marble attains the form incorporated into it by the sculptor. Accidents may happen so that (1) the process is deflected from its "natural" goal or (2) it is stopped short of the goal. But on the whole the world of change is orderly and repetitive.

This assumption is linked with the conception of nature as a system of classes in which the general characters are the final cause of the members. No technique is anywhere indicated by Aristotle for telling what the natural classes are, but we do not have to linger over this difficulty. Whatever the technique, it will be logical rather than empirical.

Aristotle's great problem, as we have said, is the fitting of the world of observation into what we have called elsewhere the "order of nature." This becomes a problem because time does

not exist in the latter, though it is an integral part of the former, wherefore individual things may be other than they really are, due to chance, corruption, perversion, etc. If Aristotle had assumed that things were really processes, of which the end term was what he called the form, and the essence were the peculiar characteristics of the whole process, then he would have made a longitudinal analysis of the world instead of a lateral. Having made a lateral analysis, he had the following difficulty on his hands: some things, like minerals, seem to be whatever they are at all times; they do not show any process of development; they are dead.<sup>6</sup> Others, like living beings, grow into their final cause. The model for his logical universe is the former group of things and through the concept of potentiality he thought that he was able to accommodate one to the other. The result was that the world of living beings became a world of processes which were cyclical; that is, when an individual reached maturity, it passed its form over to its descendants to be realized in them once again, and so on world without end. This corresponds to the circular movement of the heavens, only in the heavens it is the same individuals which repeat their course. Since different individuals arise in the world of living beings, one must answer the question of what happens to their matter. It takes on, of course, new forms, but there can be no knowable law which will determine or describe what form it will take on. The investigator will reply to this question that he as, for instance, a biologist, will have done his duty when he has described the life-cycle of the species in which he is interested. But as a philosopher he cannot rest at that point. For he sees only too clearly that the sciences are marked off from one another by the termination of realizations as well as by intra-generic differences. And the possibility remains that after a form has been realized, new questions may arise about the new forms which are bound to appear in the matter of the old ones.

The history of science shows us that new sciences arise often when such questions are asked. Thus alchemy logically—though not historically—has its origin in the question, Do material substances occur only in fixed species? Genetics may be said to answer the question, Are the characters of offspring exclusively

<sup>6</sup> But not in Plotinus. See *Enn.*, IV, iv, 27, 9.

determined by those of the parents—that is, does the *form* of the species alone determine the characters of particular members of the species? Darwin assumed as part of his theory that the variations within a species were not merely accidental but, in peripatetic language, were modifications of the specific form.

Once the assumption of fixed species and the accompanying assumption of the finitude of change are dropped, two results of major importance are found. (1) Every individual may be said to have its own form, and the class-characteristics are nothing but resemblances which determine certain generalizations but do not prevent the study of individual traits. The study of individual traits may give rise to new generalizations which will locate the individual in a new class. The statement, X is *really* a member of the class Alpha, becomes a convention established by the interests of the investigator. The question of what are the interests of a science is fundamental to a clarification of this issue. In Aristotle they consisted first, in classification; second, in the establishment of the form and the matter, not only in the genus but also in the species and subspecies. In modern science the subject matters are in part determined historically; in part, by analysis of existing subjects. Such an analysis may be made in several ways but in general it effectuates a substitution of the material and efficient cause for the final and formal cause. Matter is assumed to be heterogeneous and to have laws of its own, and, equally important, the efficient cause is assumed not to work primarily for ends. Thus the denials of fixed species and of teleology go hand in hand.

The second major result will be the substitution of the historical or genetic method for the strictly causal, and the rise of events in place of things. This will happen when the question is asked, Can *direction* be explained or is it basic?

5. *The necessity of a substratum in generation from opposites*  
(see especially, *Met.* 1087 a 36).

Generation from opposites is qualitative change or alteration. But, as we have suggested above, alteration proceeds by the appearance or disappearance of floating qualities. Qualities must qualify something. The something which they qualify is the substratum. Therefore the first principle cannot be a quality.

Aristotle is thus able to refute those of his predecessors who treat the contraries as first principles.

The strength of this assumption lies in its apparent grammatical justification. It is clear that the word "quality" and its derivatives, in Greek as well as in English, are adjectival and unless one retains a sharply critical sense, one is led into believing that grammatical usage is indicative of metaphysical fact. As has been already suggested, primary matter, the substratum, is, as used by Aristotle, nothing more than the spatial matrix and the appearance of floating qualities is always located naturally in some region of this matrix. But otherwise the assumption has very little power. It is something which helps build metaphors, being itself little more than a pervasive metaphor.

6. *The denial of action at a distance.*

"It is not right to say that such things as do not touch one another can act upon or be acted upon by one another," *De Generatione et Corruptione* 322 b 23.

To discuss all the implications of this presupposition, its use and neglect in Aristotle, the difficulties which it causes for him would require a paper double the space available. I shall therefore merely mention it to conclude this paper and suggest that its use can be literal only in cases of local motion below the moon; elsewhere it will be figurative. The main difficulty it causes concerns the Prime Mover who if he touches that which he moves may be in danger of being touched by it.

GEORGE BOAS.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.



## THE ETYMOLOGY OF BOTARGO.

In the etymological part of its article on the somewhat uncommon English word "botargo," the *Oxford English Dictionary* derives it as follows:

A[dopted from] It. *botargo*, *botarga* (now *buttarga*), ad[aptation of] Arab. بطرخة *butarkhah* 'preserved mullet-roe,' in Makrizi A. D. 1400 (in pl. بطارخ *butārikkh*, whence It. var. *bottarica*), ad[aptation of] Coptic *outarakhon*, which the Arab. word renders in a glossary published by Kircher; f[rom] Coptic *ou-* indef. art. + Gr. *ραπίχον* pickle. See Quatremère in *Journal des Savants*, Jan. 1848. (Fr. form *boutargue*, occas. found in Eng.)

To the critical philologist this etymology is neither final nor satisfying so far as it does go. The word and the food are a little out of the ordinary in English-speaking countries, but to those familiar with the rôle botargo has played (and still plays) in the Mediterranean, it would seem intrinsically unlikely that the ultimate origin of its name should be a hybrid of Greek and Coptic, forged in Egypt or Ethiopia, when for centuries the two sources of the botargo of the Mediterranean world have been the lakes of Tunis and the Black Sea. Nor, if *outarakhon* is the original, does this etymology explain whence came the B which is so prominent a feature of the English, Italian and Arabic borrowings.<sup>1</sup> The *Oxford English Dictionary* has, it would seem, rather uncritically adopted without independent investigation the

<sup>1</sup> Walter W. Skeat (see his *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, s. v. "botargo") apparently read Quatremère's Coptic as *butarakhon*, which explains why so skilled an etymologist as Skeat could be satisfied with the derivation; not being an Orientalist, he trusted Quatremère as to the Coptic article being *bu*. There is, however, no question that *outarakhon* was the form quoted by Kircher, *Lingua Aegyptiaca Restituta* (Rome, 1643), p. 200 (not 290, as the index states), "ΟΥΤΑΡΑΧΟΝ *bottarga* بطارخ." This word is not found in standard Coptic dictionaries (Tattam, Parthy, Veysierre la Croze, Spiegelberg, Crum), but ΤΑΡΙΧΙΟΝ, ΤΑΡΙΧΕ are met with—probably as transliterations of Greek—as equivalents of the native term ΧΙΡ (W. E. Crum, *Coptic Dictionary* [Oxford, 1929-1939], pp. 780-781). The *ou-* here may be the Coptic indefinite article; but see *infra*, note 14.

etymology off-handedly suggested by the Orientalist Étienne Quatremère.<sup>2</sup>

Now the ultimate origin of the word "botargo" must certainly be the Greek phrase  $\phi\acute{\alpha}$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\chi\alpha$ , meaning "eggs [of fish] preserved by salting"—a far more exact description of the substance in question than  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\chi\iota\omicron\nu$  "pickle." We meet foreshadowings of this phrase already in ancient literature,<sup>3</sup> and by the fifteenth century it appears as a standard, international commercial term.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Quatremère's article (*Journal des Savants*, January, 1848, pp. 37-49) is a review of A. P. Pihan's *Glossaire des mots français tirés de l'arabe, du persan et du turc* (Paris, 1847). After discussing a few words from Pihan's book, Quatremère mentions some others that could have been included, among them *boutargue* (which he regards as Provençal, not French), which he discusses on pp. 44-45. He suggested that *outarakhon* was a copyist's error for *outarikhon*, or better *outarikhion*: not being primarily a classicist (the whole case illustrates the dangers of specialization) he apparently did not know either  $\alpha\upsilon\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\chi\omicron\nu$  or  $\phi\acute{\alpha}$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\chi\alpha$  (see *infra*), and naturally based all his reasoning on the Arabic of Egypt and North Africa. He mentions also that the Egyptian Arabs use *butarkhah* not only for "botargo" but for "mullet"—the fish from which it is made. But *bouri* is—at least nowadays—a commoner name for the fish: see L. Keimer, "La Boutargue dans l'Égypte ancienne," *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte*, XXI (1938/39), p. 215.

<sup>3</sup>  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  . . .  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\chi\omega\nu$   $\phi\acute{\alpha}$ , in Diphilus of Siphnos, as quoted by Athenaeus, III, 121 C; and  $\phi\acute{\alpha}$   $\iota\chi\theta\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$   $\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\rho\iota\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$ , in Eustathius (12 cent.), *De emendanda vita monachica*, 66 (Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, 135, col. 785). Eustathius' phrase certainly, and that of Diphilus possibly, cover caviar as well as botargo. Caviar is the salted roe of any fish (but chiefly sturgeon and salmon) from which the membranes or egg-follicles of the original lobes have been removed. Botargo is salted, dried and sold in the original lobes—often preserved with a coating of beeswax—and is a compact, reddish-black, nutritious mass in which the original eggs have lost their identity.

<sup>4</sup> In the earliest printed cookbook—Platina's *De Honesta Voluptate* (undated ed. pub. at Rome, probably ca. 1474; first dated edition pub. at Venice, 1475)—botargo is referred to in the Latin text as *ova tarycha* (see, in the 1475 ed., fol. 86v, also fol. 4v where it is misprinted). The *De Honesta Voluptate* was a Latin version of the recipes left by Martino of Como, cook to the chamberlain and patriarch of Aquileia: and in an undated early Italian MS closely paralleling Platina's text which is in the Biting Collection in the Rare Book Room of the Library of Congress, and would seem on palaeographic grounds to be shortly subsequent to the earliest printed editions of Platina, *botarghe* corresponds to Platina's *ova tarycha*. Evidently *ova tarycha* was the international expression corresponding to the peculiar Italian word, which the Italians them-

This, however, has already been suspected.<sup>5</sup> Its final establishment is a corollary to the solution of the other main problem of the case—to establish definitively the actual route by which *ῥά τάριχα* came into English, and show where and how along this route it became corrupted into *botargo*. We believe we have discovered the final answer to this problem in the dialects of modern Greek.

The ancient classical Greek word *ῥόν* was replaced, first by *ῥόν* in Hellenistic Greek, and then in the standard modern idiom by the form (whose own history is not uninteresting) *αῦγόν*. Consequently *ῥά τάριχα* became in the popular language—with a shift from plural to singular—*αὐγὸ τάριχο*, and—coalescing into one word—*αὐγοτάραχον* (in which latter a popular etymology from *ταράσσειν* has further disguised the penultimate syllable).<sup>6</sup>

But although *αῦγόν* became the word for “egg” in standard modern Greek, and is the one found in the lexica, a variety of other forms—no doubt to some extent persisting from ancient times—are used in the dialects.<sup>7</sup> If we search among these, the missing links in the history of “botargo” can soon be supplied. The Pontic dialect has *ῥβόν*;<sup>8</sup> the dialect of Axó (in central Asia

selves doubtless did not know came from that very phrase. It is not Latin, but a simple transliteration of *ῥβὰ τάριχα*—*ῥβά* being, as we shall show (see *infra*, note 8), a local dialect form for *ῥά*.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. A. P. Pihan, *Dictionnaire étymologique des mots de la langue française dérivés de l'arabe, du persan et du turc* (Paris, 1866), p. 75. He points out that the B is not an accidental part of the word; summarizes Quatremère's remarks (the theory adopted by the *O. E. D.*); and asks, “Ne serait-ce pas plutôt une altération des mots grecs *ῥά τάριχα*, *oeufs salés*?” But he has no suggestion as to the precise nature and history of this “altération.”

<sup>6</sup> Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis* (Lyons, 1688), I, col. 151: “*αὐγὸ τάριχο*, *ova piscis condita*, in Turcogr. Crusij, apud Hieron. Germanum, *αὐγοτάραχον* (leg. *τάριχον*) *exponitur ovum piscis. Italis botarga.*” The second *a* was not, as several writers supposed, a mere copyist's error, for it became standard in modern Greek. The dropping of final *ν* is of course familiar in the colloquial modern idiom.

<sup>7</sup> See Richard M. Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor* (Cambridge University Press, 1916), p. 663.

<sup>8</sup> Demosthenes E. Oeconomides, *Lautehre des Pontischen* (Leipzig, 1908), p. 75. For a bibliography of glossaries, vocabularies, and other works on modern Greek dialects, see Gustav Meyer, “Neugriechische Studien,” *Wien. Sitzb.*, CXXX (1894), Abh. 4.

Minor) has *ὀβό*, and those of Ferték and Sílata have *βό*.<sup>9</sup> In these dialects, consequently, *αὐγὸ τάριχο* or *αὐγοτάραχο* would be *ὠβοτάραχο*, *ὀβοτάριχο*, *βοτάριχο*(ν).<sup>10</sup>

It can readily be seen that such forms as these fully account for the Arabic *buṭarkhah*. To be sure, the Greek β has been sounded as [v] for centuries; but as Arabic has no V, B was not only the natural substitute but the most probable one.<sup>11</sup> We believe that the hitherto unknown early history of "botargo" is as follows. The whole story began in Pontus and its "Laz colonies" <sup>12</sup>—since this region was the center of the manufacture of caviar and botargo—with *ὠβὰ τάριχα*, the local dialectic equivalent of the classical Greek world's phrase *ὠὰ τάριχα*, *ὠὰ ταρίχων*, *ὠὰ τεταρίχόμενα*. The shift to singular which took place as the modern idiom began to develop made this *ὠβὸ τάριχο* (later *τάραχο*). Now, for *ὠβό* each Greek locality no doubt substituted its own form of the word for "egg"; and the Arabs borrowed the expression from Greeks who said *βοτάριχο*. (Though many Greek words came into Arabic through Coptic, this cannot have been the case here since the Coptic borrowing from *ὠὰ τάριχα* knew no B.) Arabic, of course, regarded the word as B-T-R-KH, and varied the vowels in accordance with its own usages.<sup>13</sup>

We may assert, then, that the Arabs borrowed *buṭarkhah* from the Greeks, whom they found eating, making, and selling it; as to the date of the borrowing, it should perhaps be noted that Quatremère's mention of Makrizi was quite casual—merely as

<sup>9</sup> Dawkins, *loc. cit.*

<sup>10</sup> For *βοτάριχον* see Heinrich Fleischer, *De glossis Habichtianis* (Leipzig, 1836), p. 70 (and, for the source of the gloss, p. 6). We have heard *ὠβοτάραχο* in the speech of natives of Kerasun on the Pontic coast. For this latter and for *ὀβοτάριχο* we have not so far been able to find occurrences in published material, but both are perfectly regular formations and completely analogous to the first.

<sup>11</sup> The representation of V by B is particularly likely when the V is bilabial, as Greek β undoubtedly was at first (cf. note 15 *infra*). An exact parallel is English *buckaroo* from Spanish *vaquero*.

<sup>12</sup> See R. M. Dawkins, *J. H. S.*, XXX (1910), p. 110.

<sup>13</sup> For the forms used in Arabic, see R. P. A. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* (2d ed., Paris, 1927), I, p. 94, col. 1; and Pihan, *loc. cit.* Keimer (*loc. cit.*, p. 237) indicates that only the plural form (which he writes *baṭāriḥ*) is current in present-day Egypt. The only singular he knows is *baṭrah*, which, however, he seems never to have heard in actual usage, as he thinks it may be theoretical.

the first illustration which came to his mind—and the date of the first occurrence of *butarkhah* in Arabic is still to be scientifically determined. The Italians of course took the word from the Arabs: again we have not the *terminus ante quem*, but we are certain that it was well established by 1500 (cf. note 4). (The fact that the Italians transliterated the Greek phrase when writing Latin, but had a word of their own when writing Italian, may indicate that they knew botargo through the Arabs before they themselves came into contact with the Greek fisheries of the Black Sea.) The English probably took “botargo” from the Italians in the sixteenth century. And we venture to suggest that the Coptic *outarakhon* is an independent borrowing—in fact not a genuine Coptic word at all, but a mere transliteration—from the Greek, in which the *ou-* is not the Coptic article, but somehow represents the syllable  $\omega\beta o-$ .<sup>14</sup>

Finally, it might be remarked that the Pontic form  $\omega\beta\acute{o}\nu$ —of which some of the other dialect forms are evidently derivatives—has an ancient and honorable lineage in Greek, being merely the prehistoric  $\omega\acute{\phi}\acute{o}\nu$ —the ancestor of the classical (Attic) word  $\phi\acute{o}\nu$ —with the digamma, expressing the sound [w], converted into a voiced labiodental spirant [v], through an intermediate bilabial spirant [ $\beta$ ].<sup>15</sup> A form  $\omega\beta\epsilon\alpha$  (plural) is mentioned by Hesychius (approximately fourth century A. D.).<sup>16</sup>

JOHN P. HUGHES,  
R. GORDON WASSON.

<sup>14</sup> A gloss exists which cites a Greek form  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\iota\chi\omicron\nu$  (Fleischer, *loc. cit.*). Kircher's Coptic form would then be a mere transliteration of this, or rather of an alternative  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\chi\omicron\nu$ ; and the  $\omicron\upsilon-$  (which may have been pronounced  $\omega\beta-$ ) must be, not the Coptic article, but some version of  $\phi\acute{o}\nu$  or  $\omega\beta\acute{o}\nu$ .

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. II, Teil I, Bd. I [Munich, 1939])*, pp. 224-25, No. 3. (The word  $\omega\beta\acute{\alpha}$  mentioned in this paragraph is a Laconian form meaning “a tribal division,” and is not to be identified with the plural of the Pontic  $\omega\beta\acute{o}\nu$ .)

<sup>16</sup>  $\omega\beta\epsilon\alpha$  τὰ ὠά. Ἀργεῖοι. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, post Ioannem Albertum recensuit Mauricius Schmidt (Jena, 1858-1862), IV, p. 317. Liddell and Scott inferred that the singular was  $\omega\beta\epsilon\omicron\nu$ ; but the word may have been heteroclitic, with alternative plurals. Or there may well have been a slight difference between the Argive and the Pontic dialect forms.



## REVIEWS.

PAUL SHANER DUNKIN. *Post-Aristophanic Comedy. Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at both Athens and Rome.* Urbana, The Univ. of Illinois Press, 1946. Pp. 192. \$2.50. (*Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, XXXI, Nos. 3-4.)

To the already enormous literature on the plays of Menander, Plautus, and Terence, the author has contributed a work which not only utilizes and adds to the conclusions of earlier scholars but which also has the merit of presenting a rather new and radical approach to the subject of Greek and Roman comedy. The reviewer would like to say at the outset that he has found the book one of the most interesting and at the same time most controversial works he has read on the subject in recent years. Dunkin is a writer with definite views; Plautus is his hero and, as he admits,<sup>1</sup> he finds it necessary to say harsh things about Menander and Terence. But he is not interested in the plays primarily as drama; his purpose is "to sketch certain phases of the social outlook of the writers of Middle and New Comedy" (1).

In one sense, Dunkin's book is a continuation of Ehrenberg's recent works on Aristophanes, but Ehrenberg used Old Comedy as a source for a detailed description of the Athenian people, and he stated his belief that New Comedy could not be so used, because the persons of Menander, in spite of their realism and psychological truth, "stand, so to speak, in a world outside time and space. . . . Life in New Comedy apes life, but was shut off from reality" (Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes*, pp. 29 f.; cf. also n. 29 on p. 270). Dunkin, although interested chiefly in the social outlook of the dramatists, believes that Menander's work *was* "a mirror of life"; in a long, interesting, and important footnote on the reality of Menander's world (131, n. 56), he discusses the views of Ehrenberg, Gomme, Tarn, and others who deny that New Comedy gives a true picture of Athenian life in the Hellenistic Age. Dunkin considers their views far too severe, and argues that the popularity of New Comedy in Greece can be explained only if much in the comedies was true to the life the spectators knew. This does not necessarily follow; certainly the plots and characters of Plautine Comedy did not give a true picture of Roman society at the end of the third century B. C., but there is no question about the popularity of the plays. Dunkin does not mention Plautus in this connection, but says that "Terence's splendid versions . . . achieved no such outstanding success in lands

<sup>1</sup> Cf. paragraph 29. Since the work is arranged by paragraphs conveniently numbered for reference, I shall follow the author's practice and cite paragraphs rather than pages. Dunkin writes in an effective, but occasionally choppy style, and some of his "paragraphs" are very short, e.g., "The boom was on" (35): "He lives too abundantly" (284); "Dependence for ideas was inevitable" (288).

where the plays were unquestionably *not* an expression of everyday life." Cf., however, 138 f., where he speaks of the close analogy between second-century Rome and fourth-century Greece. Actually, the success or failure of Terence's plays depended on many other factors, not merely on the extent to which they reflected everyday life. Furthermore, if, as Dunkin implies, Menander's plays lack universality because they do not portray the life of people who have to earn a living, how can he maintain that they are true to Athenian life? Dunkin modifies his view somewhat when he closes his footnote by quoting with apparent approval the words of Rostovtzeff that the pictures drawn by Menander and others "are not, and were not intended by them to be, complete representations of the life of the *bourgeois* class as a whole or even of individual members of it."

Dunkin's method is to analyze the lives and works of all the ancient comic playwrights after Aristophanes in an endeavor to discover two things: the attitude of the writer toward his environment, and the heredity and environment which produced that attitude; these are the two phases of what Dunkin terms "social outlook" (2, cf. 14). The conclusions to be drawn from a study of the playwrights represented only by fragments (Antiphanes, Alexis, Diphilus, Philemon, etc.) are admittedly hypothetical and are placed in a final chapter, which Dunkin considers an appendix (19). The major portion of the book consists of three long chapters on Menander, Plautus, and Terence, each chapter divided into sections: Background, Life, Characters, Attitudes, Conclusion.<sup>2</sup> The bibliography of over four pages and the index of ten pages give ample evidence of the author's thorough and scholarly approach to his material. He is fully aware of the difficulties of his task, as he states in his Introduction (3 ff.); among these difficulties are the fragmentary nature of Middle and New Comedy in Greece, the attempted reconstruction of New Comedy from Latin adaptations (a procedure both uncertain and misleading), the false idea that Greek Comedy was perfect and that all flaws (real or imagined) are to be attributed to Plautus or Terence, the danger of excessive ingenuity in the reconstruction of Greek plots.<sup>3</sup> Another difficulty (cf. 22) is that any such work as this is necessarily conditioned by the author's own "social outlook," and Dunkin frankly states his own attitude: a belief in the socially useful man, the "man whose activities tend to promote the welfare of human society as a whole" (23); this "socially useful man" is obviously the working man, as opposed to the business man, the man of property. Dunkin's attitude doubtless accounts in part for his dislike of New Comedy philosophy and his disapproval of what he believes to be the social outlook of Menander and Terence; it doubt-

<sup>2</sup> The chapter on Terence has no section on Background. In all three chapters the sections on Background and Life are very short, those on Characters and Attitudes very full and detailed. The concluding section of each chapter does little more than repeat (sometimes unnecessarily) the already summarized results of the preceding sections; cf. 63 and 89 with 133; 188 with 279; 339 with 370.

<sup>3</sup> Kuiper, whose ingenuity is mentioned by Dunkin, also illustrates the pro-Greek point of view held by Drexler, Jachmann, Norwood, and others; cf. my remarks on Kuiper in *Class. Phil.*, XXXV (1940), pp. 86 ff., 201 ff.; *C. W.*, XXXIV (1940-41), pp. 260 f.

less accounts also for many comments he makes in passing; e.g., "the man of property must have sentimentality, plenty of it, if he is thoroughly to enjoy his play" (96); "moderation: the one virtue possible to weak and little men" (352; for other attacks on moderation, which Dunkin considers a characteristically Hellenistic and Menandrian doctrine, cf. 128, 135, 343, 371); "only the man of wealth has the leisure in which to develop a system of philosophy anyway" (384, n. 1; cf. 353). In his Acknowledgment, Dunkin expresses his indebtedness and gratitude to the late Professor W. A. Oldfather for suggesting the work, for encouragement and criticism, and also "for a social outlook in certain respects not altogether uninspired by him." The influence of Professor Oldfather is seen throughout the notes, which quote copiously from his published works and from unpublished comments on the book under review;<sup>4</sup> it is evident that Oldfather shared Dunkin's dislike of the social class portrayed by Menander (cf. 131, n. 56).

Lest, in criticizing Dunkin's arguments, I give an unfair impression of the work as a whole, I wish first to quote his major conclusions. I shall limit myself here to the three playwrights whose works have survived. On Menander we read the following: "The Rich Man in Menander is, first of all, the hero of the play" (39): he is the hero "because maintaining the honor of men of property supplies the motivation for the plot" (63); "Philosophy of the man of property, this curious farrago of stylishly affected gloom, fatalism, human fellowship through suffering, imagined human woes, compensation, the whole thoroughly seasoned with conventional maxims, saturates Menander's every play . . . Menander's friends were wealthy and philosophical gentlemen, and naturally he wrote pleasant character sketches to be presented to comfortable and cultured audiences" (121): Menander "was a matchless artist. Honestly, delicately, vividly, he portrayed the life he was familiar with, the life of the well to do. Menander's comedy marks the triumph of the man of property on the stage" (131). Dunkin describes the Rich Man in Plautus as follows: "smug and sly Ancient Gallant; slinking, whining, sensual Spineless Young Man; grasping Banker; filthy Procurer; silly, long-winded Soldier. Stupid, trivial creatures, all of them" (188); in Plautus "the most significant feature is the exaltation of a new hero: the Poor Man" (189, cf. 245), but the Poor Man is summarized as "Slave, Parasite, Courtesan: a sorry bunch of rascals" (237); Plautus' characters are "one great rogues' gallery of common folks forced into meanness by their economic position. . . . (Plautus) was a poor man, and in his work may be seen the instinctive reaction of a vigorous poor man to an oppressive capitalistic system" (282). With Terence the situation is quite different: "Slavery had given Terence the habit of dependence on rich men for freedom, wealth, and social prestige"

<sup>4</sup> See Index under Oldfather; the fact that Dunkin includes so many unpublished comments by Oldfather on Greek and Roman Comedy makes the book unusually interesting and valuable; cf., e.g., the long footnote (38, n. 3), in which Oldfather discusses the Menander-Glycera tradition and the age at which girls become courtesans in different countries—a most amazing and delightful bit of erudition indeed!

(287); "Terence's six plays were art-for-art's-sake pictures of the well-to-do as the pillars of society, the setters of pace and precedent" (289); "in the plays of Terence money is the motivating factor because it is the standard of respectability" (295); the old men of the plays are "rich, solemn, honorable, quietly playing their little games and contriving their little schemes to preserve the methodical little patterns in this neat little world which they own!" (302); "the good Rich Man is the hero, and he dominates the plays in such a manner as to preserve his conventional morality" (313); the slaves and the parasites are the rascals, because "in the world of property, rascals must of necessity be men without property" (314, cf. 339); Terence's plays are "philosophical studies of wealthy men" (364, cf. 373). Dunkin's conclusions on Plautus and Terence are expressed without reserve: "Plautus is alternately inferior and superior to his original; Terence is consistently inferior" (376); "Plautus probably distrusted imperialism; Terence found his friends among the leaders of imperialism. Plautus ridiculed the Rich Man of his original in cruel caricatures; Terence exalted the Rich Man with many a flattering touch" (377); "The issue is clear-cut. The Man of Property is in the saddle and Terence is his poet; Plautus voices the Poor Man's complaint against ruthless exploitation" (381).

The statements quoted above present in broad outline the author's main contentions, but do not do justice to the wealth of illustrative material which he introduces to support his conclusions. The subtitle of the book might well be "Rich Man vs. Poor Man." Many of these conclusions, it will be noted, run counter to generally accepted views on Menander and Terence, and give a rather new picture of Plautus and his work. If Dunkin's arguments are sound, our ideas about Greek and Roman Comedy need to undergo considerable revision. But I do not believe that the arguments are sound, for several reasons. In the first place, Dunkin occasionally commits the very errors he mentions in his Introduction, i. e. unwarranted deductions from fragmentary material (e. g., 40 ff., 56, 60) or confusion between Greek and Roman elements; he states that, for the purpose of this study, Plautus and Terence must be held responsible for the contents of their plays, and it does not matter whether certain passages were in the Greek originals or not (203, cf. 20). However, it seems unwise to argue that the *Cistellaria*, one of the most Menandrian of Plautus' comedies, perhaps is "typical of Plautus' attitude toward this phase of seamy life" (232; cf. Dunkin's next statement, which is a tacit admission that the *Cistellaria* is not typical of Plautus: "In it is little if any humor; everything is in sober earnest. No slave appears except Lampadio, and he is but a weak shadow of a Plautine Slave"), or that the *Amphitruo* "is given over to the ridicule of conventional Greek religion" and that this ridicule is indicative of Plautus' attitude toward religion (281; cf. 270, where Dunkin says that "Amphitryon is the foolish Old Man, Jupiter the dashing Young Man"; what then becomes of the supposed resemblance between Jupiter and Amphitryon?).

Second, although Dunkin states that he is interested only in social outlook and makes no pretense to literary criticism (29), he appears to forget that the plays were comedies and were produced as such;

he realizes that it is "difficult to know if the playwright is expressing his individual attitude or merely writing 'in character'" (3), and yet from the speech of almost every character, rich man and slave alike, he draws conclusions concerning the social outlook of the dramatist. The plot and its intrigue, the characters with their serious or humorous problems, the moralizing which he finds so tedious, may well have dramatic and comic purposes entirely unrelated to the poet's attitude; e.g. does the slave in Menander play only a minor part "because the center of the stage is already taken by the Rich Man" (75), or because the type of plot favored by Menander did not need the slave in an active role? Is it true that in Plautus "the Slave's trickery is the natural result of his position: a man driven to cunning by ill treatment" (221), or is it the result of Plautus' understanding of broad farce and the tastes of the Roman spectators? Is it so probable that Sosia as a protatic character was introduced into the *Andria* "merely as a means whereby the young freedman-author might express his devotion and gratitude to his own former master" (354)? If the vices of the young men in the *Dis Exapaton* "merely served a dramatic purpose" (55), why cannot the same allowance be made for young men in Plautus?

A third and more serious criticism of Dunkin's method is that his classifications are far too arbitrary and evidence is often neglected or twisted to support his theories. The constant emphasis on Rich Man and Poor Man gives a wrong impression of the characters of the comedies, especially when the "grasping Banker, filthy Procurer, silly, long-winded Soldier" (188, cf. 279) are included among the Rich Men, and the Poor Man proves to be a Slave, Parasite, or Courtesan. Actually, the Rich Man of comedy is usually not a rich man at all but a middle-class land-owner or business man (as Dunkin admits, 63, n. 18). He maintains that the Courtesan in Menander is respectable and in love (98 ff.), and hardened, sensual Courtesans are exceptions, but are introduced to point a moral or make a psychological study of the Rich Man (100); in Plautus, however, the Courtesan ("pretty sorry stuff," 280) has usually been forced into business by economic pressure (cf. 230, 232); Dunkin fails here to do justice to women like Philematium (*Most.*) and Palaestra (*Rud.*). In his treatment of Plautine characters in general, he stresses first the most villainous or most stupid of each class and passes over or explains away those who do not fit into the scheme. For example, the discussion of the Rich Old Man (143 ff.) begins with *senes* like Demipho (*Merc.*) and Lysidamus (*Cas.*); that of the Rich Young Man (160) with the three suitors of Phronesium (*Truc.*); Phronesium is undoubtedly "a disgusting creature" (231), but she is not representative of the average Plautine courtesan. It is hardly accurate to say that "the Rich Man's predominant role is that of the lover" (143), even when he includes young men with the old. He admits that there are good Old Men in Plautus (151), but condemns them as stupid moralizers and later (e.g., 279) ignores them entirely. Callicles in the *Trinummus*, for instance, receives far less than his due, and Dunkin has nothing but scorn for "Honesty is the best policy"; he calls this "the Rich Man's Golden Rule" (152). One gains a decidedly false impression of the nature and variety of



Plautus' plots from the statement that "the plot proper hinges on the rascally Slave's countless and intricate maneuvers against this same Old Man and his strong box" (190); in the first place, almost half of Plautus' comedies are not of this type (*Amph.*, *Aul.*, *Capt.*, *Cist.*, *Men.*, *Rud.*, *Stich.*, *Trin.*, *Truc.*); furthermore, in most plays of trickery the deception is directed primarily against a *leno* or a *miles* (cf. *Curc.*, *Mil. Gl.*, *Pers.*, *Poen.*, *Pseud.*) and is successful; when the *senex* is deceived, the trickery usually does not succeed (*Epid.*, *Most.*); the fact that Plautus makes this distinction shows also the inadvisability of putting *senex*, *leno*, and *miles* in the same category. Another type of Rich Man in Plautus is the Spineless Young Man who "is made to appear even more spineless by the vivid contrast with the Slave's self-reliance and common sense" (198); this both ignores the many occasions when the Plautine slave, for purposes of comedy and suspense, is portrayed as helpless and at a loss (e.g., *Epid.* 81 ff., *Most.* 348 ff., 536 ff., *Pseud.* 422 ff., 1024 ff.), and makes an unwarranted distinction between the Young Man in Plautus ("pretty sorry stuff," 160) and the Young Man in Terence (good and respectable, cf. 306). Many *adulescentes* of Terence (e.g., Antipho in the *Phormio*, Ctesipho in the *Adelphi*) are as spineless as the average Plautine youth (cf. 305, n. 8). To return to the Old Man, who, according to Dunkin, is Terence's hero and therefore a thoroughgoing gentleman (290), it is interesting to note the author's method of dealing with characters who do not fit into his classifications; e.g., Chremes (*Phormio*) is "a thorough scamp," but "he is allowed to cut so sorry a figure because he has actually lost his own money. . . . Hence, the class of Good Rich Man is not disgraced, because Chremes is no longer rich" (299, n. 4); if, on the contrary, a Poor Man is a decent fellow, he obviously can't be poor, so he becomes what Dunkin calls the Stage-Poor Man, a person not really poor, but merely less rich than his neighbors (cf. 70), e.g., Hegio and Sostrata in the *Adelphi* (337). It is perhaps worth pointing out that Hegio is not only called *pauper* (*Ad.* 948), but is considered sufficiently impoverished to share in Micio's reluctant generosity. But Dunkin would be as unwilling to admit that a poor man in Terence could have nobility of character as he would be to find a spark of decency in a rich man in Plautus.

Dunkin makes many other statements and comments that are open to criticism. I mention the following as among the more significant: (1) The relationship between old men and young men in Menander and Terence can be only "that of sincere trust and affection" (56, cf. 309); for Menander, how can we be so sure? For Terence, what of Ctesipho in the *Adelphi* (cf. especially *Ad.* 518 ff.)? (2) How can we know that the original of the *Bacchides* "was a philosophical study of the reaction of the Rich Man to luxury" (81, cf. 49, 127)? But Dunkin's conception of Menander makes no allowance for a slave-controlled play of deception, and so the *Dis Exapaton* can bear but little resemblance to the *Bacchides*.<sup>5</sup> We have too little of

<sup>5</sup> But Dunkin thinks (127) that the *Dis Exapaton*, like the *Heauton* and the *Adelphi B*, probably had two old men and two young men; this suggests that the dual plot, which Norwood (*The Art of Terence*

Menander preserved to assert that the slave is "shoved into the background so that the Rich Man may steal the show" (89). (3) It may be questioned whether "Roman Comedy took Middle and New Comedy (rather than Aristophanes) for its model, perhaps, not alone for simple reasons of approximate contemporaneity, but also because second-century Rome was in a stage of development roughly analogous to that of fourth-century Greece" (138). But Roman Comedy began in the third century, before the influx of slave labor and the resultant bankruptcy of the small farmer. The Romans did not go back to Aristophanes primarily because his plays were too difficult to adapt and too filled with references to local personages and contemporary events to appeal to a Roman audience. New Comedy dealt with more universal themes and had plots and characters readily intelligible to the Romans, as Dunkin implies (131, n. 56), when he quotes Koerte to the effect that the people of Menander, interested only in property and pleasure, have been "easily understood in all ages and by all nations." (4) Most students of ancient comedy look upon the parasite as a comic character, who is funniest when his desire for food is thwarted (e.g., *Peniculus* in the *Menaechmi*, *Gelasimus* in the *Stichus*); Dunkin considers the parasite "a pathetic figure which none but a social order so selfish as to be utterly hard-hearted, could possibly regard as amusing" (222), and he finds Hegio (in the *Captivi*) an unsympathetic figure because he has the heart "to trifle cruelly with the Parasite's craving for food" (153). (5) The numerous metaphors in Plautus drawn from warfare (250 ff.) provide humor from the incongruity of slaves talking like victorious generals; Dunkin considers these passages "devastating ridicule against war" (259), which reveal Plautus' instinctive "reaction against war." (6) The Plautine slave is perhaps less a rascal than Dunkin believes; cf. 190, n. 34, where Dunkin rightly admits that "the Slave is loyal enough to his young master" and questions the correctness of the term "rascal"; later, he ignores the slaves' loyalty and speaks of them as "forced into meanness by their economic position" (282); cf. 317: "The Plautine Poor Man is driven by want to vice. But in Terence we meet . . . the Poor Man engaging in wanton and unscrupulous trickery, quite voluntarily and deliberately because, forsooth, the knave positively enjoys it." But what could be more misleading? Does Dunkin really think that slaves like Chrysalus, Epidicus, Palaestrio, Tranio, and Pseudolus enjoy trickery less than their Terentian counterparts, whom he considers clumsy bunglers (cf. 323). (7) In 367 ff., Dunkin discusses the problem of the Terentian prologue and suspense, and suggests that Terence may have dropped the old type of prologue, fearing that "the audience would lose interest because they already knew what was going to happen." Frank's theory that there was no suspense before Terence and the oft-quoted statement that the pre-Terentian prologue told what was going to happen, are both unsupported by an examination of the prologues of Plautus. The prologue often gives information which facilitates dramatic irony

---

[Oxford, 1923], p. 127) calls Terence's "greatest achievement in construction," was favored originally by Menander, however much Terence developed the method.

(cf. Harsh, quoted by Dunkin, 369, n. 42) and occasionally foretells the recognition, but almost never gives an outline of the plot. Perhaps the most striking exception is the prologue of the *Miles* (79-155), spoken by Palaestrio; this summarizes the deception of Sceledrus (which is subordinate to the main action of the comedy). References to a final recognition or happy ending (e.g., *Aul.* 30 ff., *Capt.* 40 ff., *Men.* 70 ff., *Poen.* 120 ff.) neither outline the plot of the play nor destroy the spectator's interest in the action to come. Almost half of Plautus' plays either are without prologues (*Curc.*, *Epid.*, *Most.*, *Pers.*, *Stich.*) or have prologues which give no foreknowledge (*Asin.*, *Merc.*, *Pseud.*, *Trin.*). But the erroneous idea that "the broad outlines of Plautus' plots are generally clear from the beginning" (360, n. 40) appears to have an amazing, if undeserved, vitality.

The reviewer of a book such as this is in a difficult position. If Dunkin's conclusions are in part the result of his own social outlook (as I believe to be the case), the same may be said of the unfavorable criticisms of a reviewer (cf. 22). Furthermore, Dunkin points out that the teacher "naturally tends to identify his interests with those of the 'middle class'" (63, n. 18), i. e. the Rich Man. But unfavorable criticism of Dunkin's theories need not imply a lack of sympathy for the common man, helpless victim of an unjust economic condition; it might rather imply that the evidence from the comedies does not support the conclusions of this book. There is undoubtedly far more caricature and gross exaggeration in Plautus than in Terence, but I am still not convinced that Plautus distrusted imperialism and ridiculed rich men as such, or that Terence favored imperialism and exalted rich men. Dunkin's book is a valuable storehouse of interesting material on Greek and Roman comedy, but it must be used with extreme care; in it are many pitfalls for the unwary. It is not basically a cheerful book; cf. 136: "The tragedy of the Greek man of property is much the tragedy of that creature which our myopic egotism calls 'modern man'; . . . in his very victory he had protected his children from the need to fight, and from the strength which fighting brings. And in this strange new world of his own creation he sees them grow soft and philosophic and find life futile."

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

---

EDWARD T. NEWELL. *The Byzantine Hoard of Lagbe*. New York, The American Numismatic Society, 1945. Pp. 22; 7 pls. (*Numismatic Notes and Monographs*, No. 105.)

In the spring of 1920 heavy rains washed from the earth at Ali Fachreddin Koi a hundred and two pieces of Imperial Byzantine gold of the eighth and ninth centuries. From the hands of their peasant finders they passed into those of an Italian nobleman and ended five in the Museo delle Terme, ninety-seven in the amazing collection of Edward T. Newell. They are now published, skillfully and accurately, from a manuscript written by the owner of the ninety-seven some years before his death in 1941.

Newell was a brilliant collector. He aimed not only to secure great rareties (which he did) or pieces beautiful in themselves (which he possessed in numbers) but also as thoroughly as possible to document in his own cabinet the coinages of states whose issues were his particular study. And Newell was among the best of the scholar-numismatists of his time. From his first serious work on the Alexander coinage in 1911 to his last great book on the early Seleucid coinages in 1941 the problems of classification and attribution constantly concerned him. His writing is precise in the record of evidence, careful in arguing its significance. These are qualities which Newell so valued that his charity sometimes failed him when he found them lacking in others,—as when he wrote of an unfortunate scholar's "almost uncanny ability to misinterpret Greek coin types and to make impossible attributions," or of another's argument to prove certain coins forgeries: "Now this is exactly like arbitrarily dating the Olympia temple at, say, 400 B. C. and then arguing that since the Parthenon in stylistic development surely comes after Olympia but is as obviously earlier than the year 400 B. C., *ergo* the Parthenon must be a modern forgery!" It is rare to find in Newell's writings such censure—not that he lacked reason, but he was an amiable man and his own appointed tasks were (I suppose) so demanding that they left him little time to scold the witlessness of his fellows.

Much of what he knew, or could divine, he has published. He has put order into a disordered mass of coinages, and so done very much to prepare a large body of evidence on the financial history of the states of those extravagant days of Alexander and the Successors when men—without nuclear fission—seem still to have been quite mad. Newell's contemporaries will return to his works for knowledge, and for a long time to come scholars will not neglect him.

#### A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF EDWARD T. NEWELL.

(The items in this bibliography supplied by Sawyer McA. Mosser I have marked with his initials. Between us we have compiled a bibliography somewhat more complete than that published on pp. 268-269 of *The Numismatist* for April, 1941.)

##### 1906

- "A Survey of the Coinage of Alexander's Successors." *The Elder Monthly*, 1906, pp. 8-11 [SMM]

##### 1910

- "The Gold Medallions of Abukir." *American Journal of Numismatics*, XLIV, 1910, pp. 128-130

##### 1911-1912

- "Reattribution of Certain Tetradrachms of Alexander the Great." *American Journal of Numismatics*, XLV, 1911, pp. 1-10, 37-45, 113-125, 194-200, and XLVI, 1912, pp. 22-24, 37-49, 109-116 (also printed separately: New York, American Numismatic Society, 1912 [SMM])
- "A Tetradrachm of Gela." *The Numismatist*, 1912, p. 121 [SMM]

Review of Graf Dessewffy Miklos, *Barbar Penzel. American Journal of Numismatics*, XLV, 1911, p. 80

## 1913

"The Oldest Known 'Siege-Pieces'." *The Numismatist*, 1913, pp. 243-245 [SMM]

## 1914

"A Cilician Find." *Numismatic Chronicle*, fourth series, XIV, 1914, pp. 1-33

"Some Rare or Unpublished Greek Coins." *American Journal of Numismatics*, XLVIII, 1914, pp. 61-72 (also printed separately: New York, American Numismatic Society, 1915 [SMM])

## 1915

"Some Cypriote 'Alexanders'." *Numismatic Chronicle*, fourth series, XV, 1915, pp. 294-322

## 1916

"The Purchasing Value of Coins of the Classical Period." *The Numismatist*, 1916, pp. 228-232 [SMM]

*The Dated Alexander Coinage of Sidon and Ake.* Yale Oriental Series, Researches II. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1916

## 1917

"The Seleucid Mint of Antioch." *American Journal of Numismatics*, LI, 1917, pp. 1-151 (also printed separately: New York, American Numismatic Society, 1918)

## 1918

"Tarsos Under Alexander." *American Journal of Numismatics*, LII, 1918, pp. 69-115 (also printed separately: New York, American Numismatic Society, 1919 [SMM])

"The Alexandrine Coinage of Sinope." *American Journal of Numismatics*, LII, 1918, pp. 117-127 (also printed separately: New York, American Numismatic Society, 1919 [SMM])

"The Coinage of Ancient Palestine." *Art and Archaeology*, 1918, pp. 206-211

## 1919

"Myriandros-Alexandria Kat'Isson." *American Journal of Numismatics*, LIII (Part II), 1919, pp. 1-42 (also printed separately: New York, American Numismatic Society, 1920 [SMM])

"Nikokles, King of Paphos." *Numismatic Chronicle*, fourth series, XIX, 1919, pp. 64-65

"The Pre-Imperial Coinage of Roman Antioch." *Ibidem*, pp. 69-113

## 1921

*The Octobols of Histiaea.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 2. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1921

*Alexander Hoards—I, Introduction and Kyprissia Hoard.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 3. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1921



*The First Seleucid Coinage of Tyre.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 10. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1921

1923

*Tyros Rediviva.* New York, American Numismatic Society, 1923

*Alexander Hoards—II, Demanhur, 1905.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 19. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1923

*Alexander Hoards—III, Andritsaena.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 21. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1923

Review of G. F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Arabia, Mesopotamia and Persia (A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum).* Numismatic Chronicle, fifth series, III, 1923, pp. 158-164

1924

"A Parthian Hoard." Numismatic Chronicle, fifth series, IV, 1924, pp. 141-180

"Egyptian Coin Hoards." The Numismatist, 1924, pp. 301-302 [SMM]

1925

*Mithradates of Parthia and Hyspaosines of Characene: A Numismatic Palimpsest.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 26. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1925

1926

*Some Unpublished Coins of Eastern Dynasts.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 30. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1926

1927

*The Coinages of Demetrius Poliorcetes.* London, Oxford University Press, 1927

*Two Recent Egyptian Hoards.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 33. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1927

Review of S. W. Grose, *Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Greek Coins*, Volume II. American Journal of Archaeology, XXXI, 1927, p. 521

1929

*Alexander Hoards—IV, Olympia.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 39. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1929

1930

Review of S. W. Grose, *Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Greek Coins*, Volume III. American Journal of Archaeology, XXXIV, 1930, pp. 524-525

1931

"Additions to the Delta (Benha-el-Asl) Hoard." Numismatic Chronicle, fifth series, XI, 1931, pp. 66-68

*The Kuchuk Köhne Hoard.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 46. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1931

## 1932

Chapter IV, "Coins," pp. 51-74 of *Researches in Anatolia*, Volume III, *The Alishar Hüyük, Season of 1927*, Part II, by Hans Henning von der Osten and Erich F. Schmidt, with a chapter by Edward T. Newell (The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, Volume VII). Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1932

Review of Alfred R. Bellinger, *Catalogue of the Coins Found at Corinth, 1925*. *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXXVI, 1932, pp. 578-579

## 1933

*The Fifth Dura Hoard*. Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 58. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1933

*Two Hoards from Minturno*. Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 60. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1933

Review of *Yale Classical Studies*, Volume III, "Seleucid Babylonia: Bullae and Seals of Clay with Greek Inscriptions," by M. Rostovtzeff; "A Neo-Pythagorean Source in Philo Judaeus," by Erwin R. Goodenough; "Agriculture in the Life of Pompeii," by John Day. *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXXVII, 1933, pp. 640-642

## 1934

*A Hoard from Siphnos*. Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 64. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1934

"Un Monnayage de Bronze de Deiotarus." *Revue belge de numismatique*, LXXXVI, 1934, pp. 5-10

"Inflation in Ancient Times as Exemplified by Coinage." *The Numismatist*, 1934, pp. 19-23

"Philetaerus." *Coin Collectors Journal*, I, 1934-1935, pp. 8-9 (reprinted with revision in *Royal Greek Portrait Coins*, 1937) [SMM]

"The Coinage of Philip of Macedon." *Ibidem*, pp. 51-53.  
 "... of Alexander the Great." *Ibidem*, pp. 123-126, 128.  
 "... of Demetrius Poliorcetes." *Ibidem*, pp. 169-171, 179.  
 "... of Seleucus I." *Ibidem*, pp. 217-220.  
 "... of Ptolemy I." *Ibidem*, pp. 261-264 (all reprinted with revision in *Royal Greek Portrait Coins*, 1937) [SMM]

## 1935

*Five Greek Bronze Coin Hoards*. Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 68. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1935

"The Coinage of Lysimachus." *Coin Collectors Journal*, II, 1935-1936, pp. 33-35 (reprinted with revision in *Royal Greek Portrait Coins*, 1937) [SMM]

Nos. M 2268—M 2269 on p. 39 of *The Megiddo Water System*, by Robert S. Lamon (The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, Volume XXXII). Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1935

Review of Gholam-Reza Kian, *Introduction à l'Histoire de la Monnaie et Histoire Monétaire de la Perse des Origines à la Fin de la Période Parthe*. *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXXIX, 1935, pp. 421-422

## 1936

*The Seleucid Coinage of Tyre*. Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 73. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1936

*The Pergamene Mint Under Philetaerus*. Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 76. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1936

Review of Hugo Gaebler, *Die Antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands, Makedonia und Paionia*, Band III, Zweite Abteilung. *American Journal of Archaeology*, XL, 1936, pp. 395-397

## 1937

*Royal Greek Portrait Coins, Being an Illustrated Treatise on the Portrait Coins of the Various Kingdoms, and Containing Historical References to their Coinages, Mints, and Rulers*. New York, Wayte Raymond, 1937

Chapter VI, "Coins," pp. 310-323 of *Researches in Anatolia*, Volume IX, *The Alishar Hüyük, Seasons of 1930-32*, Part III, by Hans Henning von der Osten, with contributions by Wilton Marion Krogman and others (The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, Volume XXX). Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1937

Review of Robert Harbold McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris*. *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLI, 1937, pp. 515-517

Review of J. de Morgan, *Manuel de Numismatique Orientale de l'Antiquité et du Moyen Age*, Volume I. *Ibidem*, pp. 517-518

Review of Harold Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, Volume III, *Nerva to Hadrian*. *Ibidem*, pp. 518-519

Review of Z. Barczay-Amant, *The Hoard of Komin (Antoniniani of the Third Century A. D.)*. *Ibidem*, pp. 651-652

Review of Harold Mattingly and Edward A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, Volume IV, Part I, *Pertinax to Geta*. *Classical Weekly*, XXX, 1937, pp. 163-164

## 1938

*The Coinage of the Eastern Seleucid Mints from Seleucus I to Antiochus III*. Numismatic Studies I. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1938

*Miscellanea Numismatica, Cyrene to India*. Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 82. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1938

"The Coinage of the Parthians," Chapter 27, pp. 475-492 of Volume I and plates 140-144 of Volume IV of *A Survey of Persian Art from Prehistoric Times to the Present*, by Arthur Upham Pope and Phyllis Ackerman. London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1938 [SMM]

1939

*Late Seleucid Mints in Ake-Ptolemais and Damascus.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 84. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1939

"Standard Ptolemaic Silver." *Coin Collectors Journal*, VI, 1939, pp. 83-98 (reprinted as No. 7 of the Coin Collectors Series, 1941) [SMM]

"The Coins [from Meggido]," pp. 196-212 of *Meggido I, Seasons of 1925-34, Strata I-V*, by Robert S. Lamon and Geoffrey M. Shipton (The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, Volume XLII). Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939 [SMM]

Review of Erik Gren, *Der Münzfund von Viminacium, Vorläufiger Bericht.* *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLIII, 1939, pp. 719-720

Review of E. S. G. Robinson, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum*, Volume III, *The Lockett Collection*, Part I, *Spain-Italy.* *Ibidem*, p. 720

1940

"A Seleucid Mint at Dura-Europus" (with Alfred R. Bellinger). *Syria*, XXI, 1940, pp. 77-81 (also printed as an appendix to the following item)

1941

*The Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints from Seleucus I to Antiochus III.* Numismatic Studies IV. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1941 (with an appendix "A Seleucid Mint at Dura-Europus" [with Alfred R. Bellinger] also printed in *Syria*, XXI, 1940, pp. 77-81)

*Standard Ptolemaic Silver.* The Coin Collectors Series, No. 7. New York, Wayte Raymond, 1941

Review of Harold Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, Volume IV, *Antoninus Pius to Commodus.* *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLV, 1941, pp. 139-140

1945

*The Byzantine Hoard of Lagbe.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 105. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1945 (a posthumous publication)

PAUL A. CLEMENT.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS.  
THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY.

---

DAG NORBERG. *L'Olympionique, le Poète, et leur Renom éternel.* Contribution à l'étude de l'ode I, 1 d'Horace. Uppsala, A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln; Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz, 1945. Pp. 42. (*Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift*, 1945, No. 6.)

This pamphlet seeks to prove that Horace's Ode, I, 1, instead of being "plane ridicula" as Hermann said, or ironical (K. Fulda,

Heinze and Risberg), imitates Pindar in asserting that an Olympian victor and a lyric poet pursue the two greatest careers possible to a mortal, who is thus raised to the level of the gods. Such is the kernel embedded in an intricate mass at least six times too large; and the title-page seems to imply that this is what we are expected to enunciate—though even here lies confusion, eternal fame being not the same as equality with gods.

To make this contention good, the three following points, and these alone, need proof.

(i) That vv. 3-5 (*sunt quos curriculo . . . nobilis*) do not describe an example parallel with those next enumerated—the politician, merchant, etc.—but a man analogous only to Horace himself as described in the last two stanzas (*me doctarum hederæ . . . feriam sidera vertice*).

(ii) That the *olympionique* and the poet are raised by their achievements to Heaven and association with the gods.

(iii) That the above two ideas are borrowed from Pindar.

To prove (i), we must take v. 6, *terrarum dominos evehit ad deos*, only with the *olympionique* just mentioned, not with the following politician, etc.; and Norberg rightly does so.<sup>1</sup> We have then to discover a syntax for *hunc* and *illum* (vv. 7-10). In note 79 he correctly understands *iuvat* from v. 4 with both accusatives, but with *hunc* understands also *evehit ad deos*, gratuitously ruining this part of his case. If, however, we ignore that inexplicable lapse, we can recognize two descriptions,<sup>2</sup> analogous to one another but quite different from the intervening types: the *olympionique* whom his victory *evehit ad deos*, and Horace whom his garlands *dis miscent superis*, etc.

To prove (ii) seems to Norberg no task at all. He takes the phrases just quoted as meant literally, writing, e. g., on p. 25, "il dit que . . . la palme de la victoire et la couronne de lierre conduisent l'olympionique et le poète aux Dieux . . . La mise en parallèle de l'olympionique et du poète et les rapports de ces deux idéals avec les Dieux, sont deux éléments essentiels du poème d'Horace."

The present reviewer, though determined not to beg this question (or any other), cannot but express his conviction that we must not take these phrases literally: first, because Horace cannot have believed that he would really strike the stars with his head, however muscular an assistant Maecenas may have been; second, because this kind of language is fairly common in Latin,<sup>3</sup> as it could not be if meant literally. Surely Heinze (quoted on p. 30) is right in calling *sublimi feriam sidera vertice* the "stärkster Ausdruck freudigen Stolzes" and paraphrasing with "so fühle ich mich übergelukkig."

To prove (iii) is flatly impossible. Norberg's contention is set forth on p. 25 (see above). After saying that the bracketing of

<sup>1</sup> His identification of *terrarum dominos* with *deos* is, however, highly doubtful (despite, e. g., Orelli-Baiter-Hirschfelder *ad loc.*). Why insert a lumbering and otiose description of the gods? Birt's explanation (*Horaz' Lieder*, p. 111, quoted by Norberg, p. 32) is immensely better: that Horace, of course with Pindar in mind, points at men like Thero and Hiero.

<sup>2</sup> But descriptions of what? See below, on (ii).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. for instance Cicero's use of *divinus*, *divinitus*, etc.



*olympionique* and poet, and the relations of these with the Gods, are essential elements in Horace's poem, he proceeds: "Ces deux éléments, nous prétendons qu'il les a trouvés dans Pindare."

The parallelism of *olympionique* and poet in Pindar is a figment. True, he often sets himself beside the victor; but not at all, so far as anywhere appears, because he sees a fundamental likeness; the reason is that his complete works deal with Olympian, and closely similar, victors. The juxtaposition, though not inevitable, is extremely obvious. What Norberg needs, and cannot adduce, is evidence from the fragments, by no means scanty, of non-epinician poems.

The opposition between *olympionique* and lyric poet on the one side, and soldier, politician, etc., on the other is nowhere to be found. Pindar does give lists of occupations not unlike that in our Horatian ode:

*Pyth.* I, 41 f.:

ἐκ θεῶν γὰρ μαχαναὶ πᾶσαι βροταῖς ἀρεταῖς,  
καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ χερσὶ βιαταὶ περιγλωσ-  
σοί τ' ἔφυν.

*Isth.* I, 47 f.:

μσθὸς γὰρ ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ἀνθρώποις γλυκὺς,  
μηλοβότα τ' ἀρότα τ' ὄρ-  
νιχολόχῳ τε καὶ ὄν πόντος τράφει.

*Fr.* 208 (Bowra), 221 (Schroeder):

ἀελλοπόδων μὲν τιν' εὐφραίνουσιν ἵππων  
τίμα καὶ στέφανοι, τοὺς δ' ἐν πολυχρύ-  
σοις θαλάμοις βιοτά·  
τέρπεται δὲ καὶ τις ἐπ' οἶδμ' ἄλιον  
ναῖ θεῶν σῶς διαμείβων.

But we have no reason at all to suppose that any of these even hints at the Horatian comparison.

Finally, the case for deification or quasi-deification by Pindar of these two human types is if possible weaker still. It would be absurd to enumerate the passages in which he urges kings, athletic victors, and indeed everyone within earshot to remember their mortal estate, and not seek to transcend it. Perhaps the most impressive is the first strophe of *Nem.* VI, which, since Norberg (p. 27) quotes it as supporting him, it may be well to quote in full.

Ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν θεῶν γένος· ἐκ μιᾶς δὲ πνέομεν  
ματρὸς ἀμφοτέρω· διείργει δὲ πᾶσα κεκρμμένα  
δύναμις, ὡς τὸ μὲν οὐδέν, ὃ δὲ χάλκεος ἀσφαλὲς αἰὲν ἔδος  
μένει οὐρανός. ἀλλὰ τι προσφέρωμεν ἔμπαν ἢ μέγαν  
νόον ἥτοι φύσιν ἀθανάτοις,  
καίπερ ἐφαμερίαν οὐκ εἰδότες οὐδὲ μετὰ νύκτας ἄμμε πότμος  
οἶαν τιν' ἔγραψε δραμεῖν ποτὶ στάθμαν.

Surely it is plain that Pindar here not only asserts our kinship with the gods, but also insists on the vast difference that nevertheless separates us from them. The words ἀλλὰ τι προσφέρωμεν . . . ἀθανάτοις are arresting, indeed, but do not destroy the meaning of

the whole passage. Norberg, however, finds the hardihood to claim them as endorsing his main thesis: "Lorsqu'il écrivit ces mots, Pindare faisait allusion aux poètes et aux athlètes, les deux idéals qu'il plaçait par-dessus tous les autres. Comme, en effet, l'adjectif μέγαν le montre, ce n'était pas tous les hommes qui ressemblaient aux Dieux, mais seulement quelques élus." That is θέσιν διαφυλάττειν with a vengeance.

Had Norberg been content with Pindar's frequent allusions to "immortality" of *renown* for both victor and poet (as on his title-page), no one could have complained. But this would not have helped his theory that Horace's deification-idea comes from Pindar.

The confusion is increased by the presence of topics irrelevant to his thesis. On pp. 6 ff., we find discussion of the four βίοι (Plato, *Rep.* 581 C, Aristotle, *Ethics*, and popular philosophy) which leads nowhere. Norberg astonishingly reports (p. 25) that the βίος φιλόσοφος is dear to Pindar's heart, and that he loves to talk of it. Indeed, most of his statements about Pindar are incorrect: for example (pp. 27 f.) fr. 133 (Bowra 127), which says that βασιλῆες ἀγανοί and others ἥρωες ἀγνοὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων καλέονται, is interpreted as meaning that they "sont admis parmi les Dieux." The constant assertion that for Pindar the *olympionique* (together with the poet) stands at the head of human beings, is contradicted—in an epinician, be it noted—by the statement (*Ol.* I, 113 f.):

ἐν ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· τὸ δ' ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται  
 βασιλεῦσι.

The paragraph on pp. 28 f. about Ajax and Odysseus, though quite irrelevant, is brief; but on pp. 13-26 occurs a long, interesting, yet utterly obtrusive account of the "trionphateur romain" whom Horace (we are told) substitutes—not in our Ode, of course—for the Olympian victor. Finally, the long account (pp. 16-23) of the changes which came over Horace's conception of his own function as poet has little if anything to do with the subject. It is, however, by far the best thing in the pamphlet.

GILBERT NORWOOD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

---

SISTER M. MONICA WAGNER. *Rufinus, the Translator: A Study of his Theory and his Practice as illustrated in his Version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory Nazianzen.* Washington, D. C., The Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1945. Pp. xiii + 100.

This doctoral dissertation written at the Catholic University of America is divided roughly into two parts. Sister Monica offers first a general discussion of Rufinus' aims and methods as a translator and then, in order to test his application of his theories, gives a detailed analysis of his methods in the translation of St. Gregory Nazianzen's *Apologetica*. The general discussion includes a review of criticism of Rufinus and a study of St. Jerome's theory and practice in translation as well as the testimony of Rufinus himself

upon the subject. The analysis of the *Apologetica*, which comprises about two-thirds of the whole, is presented under three heads: Adaptation Procedures, Some Structural Modifications, and Biblical Citations. The analysis is thorough, but I question whether the point involved justifies so long and elaborate a presentation. Certainly it is the first part of this book, with its discussion of theories of translation in the age of St. Jerome that will interest and challenge most readers.

Sister Monica defends with vigor the thesis that "it would be a perverse critic indeed who would set about judging the Latin versions of Rufinus according to a criterion of verbal fidelity" (p. 29). There have of course been several such perverse critics, but I believe most students will concede the justice of the author's protest. It was no doubt the privilege of Rufinus as well as of Jerome, "whose methods in translation he claimed to imitate" (p. viii), to set up his own standards of translation. After a translator has made it perfectly clear in his prefaces that he is not attempting a version *verbum de verbo* and that he intends not merely to translate for his readers but also to edify them, there can be no purpose in pointing out that there are indeed omissions, additions, and other changes. In making alterations the translator has done precisely what he set out to do. Sister Monica safely establishes that Rufinus had his own theory, according to which he defined translation as adaptation, and that in translating the *Apologetica* he carried out theory in practice.

The author is not so successful, however, when she attempts to establish also in behalf of Rufinus the translator the "positive value" of his "translation procedures" (pp. 63-64, 98). That the translations follow the theory prescribed for them by the translator does not mean that they are good translations. That Rufinus wished to edify and consequently characterized "the translator's art as a re-working of old materials" and "the original text as a foundation upon which his versions were constructed" does not make such characterizations acceptable even "on the part of a fourth-century translator who openly and repeatedly announces these methods to his readers as required for his purpose and who justly appeals to precedent in support thereof" (p. 98). Neither do Rufinus' diligence and his belief that his course of adaptation was more difficult than verbal fidelity bear upon the quality of his work as translation. The charge to be made against Rufinus as a translator is neither that he was careless and hasty nor that he followed the sense rather than the words. His fault is rather that his purpose was not simply to translate from one language to another but to write a commentary, to be an ethical teacher, and to popularize. Jerome was quite justified in his accusation that because of his stated aims Rufinus assumed the responsibility of an author rather than that of a translator (*Apol. adv. Ruf.*, I, 7, quoted p. 21, n. 129).

Fundamentally the question involved here, and it is an important one, is what the duties and rights of a translator are. Do they go beyond fidelity combined with clarity? In my opinion they do not. I should agree with Sister Monica that Rufinus' "free handling of his original" does not make him *ipso facto* "a careless and dishonest worker and unequal to his task" (p. vii). The author does not seem

to be aware, however, that it is not Rufinus' free treatment of his original that is to be criticized but rather his judgment and sometimes his intention. He went astray in not letting us know simply and clearly what his authors said without altering their text—and he could have done this in a free as well as in a literal translation. The objection to be made to Rufinus as a translator then is not just that he "did not see fit to include the textual critic as a beneficiary of his labors" (p. 98) but that he sometimes tampered with the text so ruthlessly as to make his work unreliable. Where the original is missing such interference may be costly, and not to the textual critic alone but also to the historian and the theologian. In the translation of Origen's *De principiis* Rufinus' error in this respect is sufficiently serious to have brought the charge of forgery upon him.<sup>1</sup> Sister Monica does not acknowledge this grave fault. She is, I should say, too eager to overlook Rufinus' shortcomings as a translator because of his contributions as a commentator.

I hope this book will be followed by other studies of the early medieval theory and practice of translation, more broadly conceived. A short but extremely interesting step in this direction is taken by W. Schwarz in his article, "The Meaning of *Fidus Interpres* in Medieval Translation," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XLV (1944), pp. 73-78. This essay, restricted in scope because of war conditions, centers about Boethius' conception of translation. A work which considered at once the aims and methods of Jerome, Rufinus, Marius Mercator, Boethius, and Dionysius Exiguus would not be out of place. This might be only the first of a series of inquiries into the theory and practice of translation in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and for that matter in more recent times too. Much value might be derived, for example, from the study of translations of scientific texts in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Comparisons of Patristic and Renaissance versions of, say, the Greek Fathers might also prove useful.

It is clear that translation may mean many things: one may

<sup>1</sup> Gustave Bardy is cited by the author (pp. 3-5) as having a relatively favorable impression of Rufinus as a translator, particularly in his *Recherches sur l'histoire du texte et des versions latines du De principiis d'Origène* (Paris and Lille, 1923). I note, however, that in an article (not mentioned by Sister Monica) published some years after the *Recherches* Bardy expresses an adverse opinion, referring in the course of his discussion to an appropriate section of the *Recherches*. In "Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne, II," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXXII (1936), p. 283, Bardy remarks, after quoting Rufinus on the subject of interpolations in the *De principiis*: "Nous avons perdu le texte grec de ce grand ouvrage, si bien qu'il ne nous est pas possible de vérifier jusqu'à quel point l'argumentation de Rufin était fondée. Nous avons par contre la traduction latine que Rufin lui-même a donnée du *De principiis*, et nous sommes assurés que cette version est loin d'être toujours fidèle: additions, suppressions, explications y abondent [there is a reference to the *Recherches*, pp. 89-153 here], non seulement comme veut bien l'avouer l'interprète, dans les passages où le dogme trinitaire n'était pas exposé en des termes assez précis, mais ailleurs encore, si bien que nous pouvons, sans trop d'injustice, ranger l'honnête Rufin parmi les faussaires qu'il condamne avec si belle ardeur."

translate freely or word for word, as an orator or as an expositor and in all cases still be called a translator. Sister Monica is correct in maintaining that Rufinus does what he said he would do. The question remains whether his practice of injecting exposition into his translations does not seriously diminish his value as a translator.

WILLIAM C. BARK.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

NAUM JASNY. *The Wheats of Classical Antiquity*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1944. Pp. 176; 2 pls. (*The Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Series LXII, No. 3.)

The author is well qualified for the above study. He is an authority upon food grains, having published in 1940, for the Food Research Institute of Stanford University, an exhaustive study of present day grains.<sup>1</sup> Also, his familiarity with the Russian language makes accessible to him much of the most important research in recent years upon the origin of cultivated plants, grains especially,—the research of the Russian botanists Vavilov and Fliaksberger.

The purposes of the book are several. One is to bring the views of modern botanists to the attention of historians (p. 11). Another is the reinterpretation of classical references to grains with particular emphasis upon the adaptability and use of the several kinds of wheat, as for porridge and bread (p. 12). This is important. The ancients did not describe and distinguish plant types so much by morphological characteristics, e. g., flower structure, as we do. Instead, they tended to distinguish plants by their food or medicinal value, judging them by their uses, often on the criteria of flavor and odor. Thus many ancient references to specific grains describe their suitability for grits (porridge) or for flour (bread). And since certain types of wheats are definitely superior for this or that use, these references are valuable aids toward identification of the varieties of ancient wheats.

Whereas barley probably ranked first in the production of grains in Mediterranean lands around 500 B. C., it had generally yielded the first place to wheat by 500 A. D. (p. 14). Since 1918 the kinds of wheat have been classified scientifically by their chromosome number, one-kernelled wheat or einkorn having 14 chromosomes, emmer wheats having 28, and spelt types having 42 (pp. 18 f.). A commonly employed classification distinguishes wheats by the presence or absence of hulls. All einkorn has hulls, but, whereas there is a hulled form of emmer, there are also three hull-less or naked types, chief of which is durum. Likewise there are two forms of the spelt group of wheats. The hulled form is spelt proper; the naked form embraces three types, chief of which is common wheat.

<sup>1</sup> *Competition Among Grains*, Food Research Institute, Stanford University, California. Stanford University Press, 1940 (no. 2 in Grain Economic Series).



Jasny prefaces his study with a consideration of the present distribution of these kinds of wheat (pp. 22 ff.). Einkorn is the least grown and is now found in Asia Minor, in Spain, and occasionally throughout the Mediterranean and Black Sea areas as a weed in wheat fields. The type of emmer which has hulls is found in slight quantities in many Mediterranean countries, but the naked types, particularly durum, occur throughout the Mediterranean area. Durum predominates in the hotter climates, especially in Sicily and Egypt. Spelt proper has hulls and is grown only in a limited area of S. W. Germany and the adjacent portions of Switzerland, whereas the naked form of the spelt group, principally common wheat, is by far the dominant wheat grown in the world today.

Jasny outlines his thesis on pages 26-28. The present distribution of wheat types in the Mediterranean area is an indication, he believes, of the wheat types grown in antiquity. The emmer group then dominated "almost to the exclusion of the other two groups" (p. 27). The use of einkorn declined during antiquity; spelt proper did not appear till toward the end of the period and the naked forms of the spelt group made no advance over the naked forms of the emmer group until after classical times.

The remainder of the book is a compilation of data, references to modern authorities, chiefly botanists, and to ancient authors, arrayed to support Jasny's contentions. The arguments are not always easy to follow. The seeming contradiction of some of the ancient statements (especially those of Pliny, p. 38) and the difficulty of the interpretation of the many Greek and Roman names of wheats cannot easily be solved. Yet Jasny makes a good case for his thesis. *Τίφη* (*ζειὰ ἀπλῆ*), Latin *tiphe*, was einkorn (pp. 109 ff.), well suited for use as porridge but too scanty in yield to compete successfully with other wheats (p. 152). *Ζειά, ὄλυρα* (pp. 112 ff.), and *σεμιδαλίτης* (pp. 89 ff.), Latin *ador, far, and triticum*, were emmers (both hulled and naked), also well suited for porridge, good in yield, and particularly well adapted to the Mediterranean climate. This is especially true of durum, which predominated in the warmer lands (Sicily and Egypt) in classical antiquity, as it does even today (p. 91). Though ill adapted for bread, durum is sweet and best for porridge. It also yields excellent paste and has been extensively used for macaroni since the invention of that food form soon after the close of classical times.

Jasny effectively disposes of spelt proper, which was long thought to be the hulled wheat of the ancients (pp. 120 ff.). He believes the *spelta* named in the Edict of Diocletian was emmer (pp. 134 ff.). *Σιτανίας* (p. 105), Latin *siligo* (especially spring sown varieties), made the best flour and the finest bread, according to ancient authors (pp. 66 ff.). This was a naked form of the spelt group, chiefly common wheat. It was sown in the spring (mostly in Italy, p. 68) and was therefore much less widely grown in antiquity than the emmers, for these wheats, being sown in the fall, adapted themselves better to the Mediterranean climate, starting their growth in the moist winters before the droughts of spring and summer.

Jasny consistently names the Loeb translator of Theophrastus' *Enquiry into Plants* as Horst (pp. 12 and 167). The correct name

is Hort. Jasny's manner of referring to Pliny's *Natural History* is confusing at times because of inconsistencies, as, for example, in notes 54 and 55 on page 102. In note 55 the complete reference is given including both the section numbers used in the Bohn translation and the number of the smaller section used in the Teubner (Mayhoff) text. In note 54, however, only the Teubner section number is given. Also, Jasny's references to Russian authors are often misleading since when translating the titles of their works, he frequently fails to indicate that the titles are merely his own translations. Actually the works do not exist in English. These are minor criticisms, however. The book is an able treatment of the subject and is valuable both for presenting the views of modern botanists and for the new approach stressing the qualities and uses of ancient wheats.

LT. G. RAYNOR THOMPSON, USNR.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

BLUMA L. TRELL. *The Temple of Artemis at Ephesos*. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1945. Pp. x + 71; 1 + 28 pls. \$2.00. (*Numismatic Notes and Monographs*, No. 107.)

When the Abbé Montfaucon published his *Antiquité Expliquée* in 1719 and 1724, long before travelers had returned from the Eastern Mediterranean with accurate delineations of Greek monuments, it was to representations on coins that he wisely limited the illustration of Greek architecture, instead of adopting the fantastic restorations of his contemporary Fischer d'Erlach. Since that time the comprehensive study of coin types as illustrative of ancient architecture has been undertaken only once, by T. L. Donaldson in his *Architectura Numismatica* published in 1859, until the last few years when, under the same general title, Donald F. Brown and Mrs. Trell wrote their unpublished dissertations on, respectively, *I, The Temples of Rome*, and *II, Temples in Asia Minor*. Both writers have published portions of their dissertations in *Numismatic Notes and Monographs*, No. 90 (1940) and No. 107 (1945). It is with the latter of these that we are here concerned.

From a study of 1800 coins of 250 types, of Roman date, representing thirty-eight temples of Asia Minor (Aphrodisias, Colophon, Ephesus [6], Erythrae, Magnesia [2], Metropolis, Miletus [2], Mylasa [2], Pergamum [4], Samos, Sardis [6], Smyrna [6], Teos [2], Tralles [2], and an unknown Asia Minor temple on coins of C. Fannius, governor in 49-48 B. C.), and from comparison with whatever is known of the actual architecture of these examples, Mrs. Trell draws valuable conclusions as to the veracity of the die-engravers. She finds that the representations are fundamentally faithful, subject to a code of abbreviation in the reduction in number, or omission, of details, and in stylization. Thus the engraver may show the proper number of columns on a façade, or fewer, but never more; an octastyle façade may be represented with any even number from two to eight, a hexastyle with any even number from two to

six, etc. The same applies to the number of steps in the platform below a colonnade. She rightly points out the fallacy of deducing facts as to restoration or even identification of a temple from one or two coins alone, since those first available might happen to be the most abbreviated ones; only by following the illustration of a temple through an entire series can one draw safe conclusions as to its basic form. She discovers, by comparison with the architectural evidence, that the die-engraver was faithful (within the limits of abbreviation) to the architectural "order" of the temple, never using the wrong types of capitals except on multiple-type coins whereon capitals might be shown as uniform on all the buildings in spite of differences in actuality. She even decides—though this is harder to prove—that the die-engraver's faithfulness was such that he never "invented" details, and that, in consequence, the spirally fluted columns shown in some illustrations of the temple of Hera at Samos, and the arcuated lintels shown over the central intervals of nine temples (including Aphrodisias, Metropolis, Samos, Sardis, and Tralles), reproduce what actually existed in late imperial times. More plausible are the pediment windows represented in five of her listed temples (Ephesus [4] and Magnesia, as well as, outside her series, Baalbek, Emesa, and Laodicea, and in actual architectural remains at Antioch in Pisidia, Baalbek [another], and Mylasa).

The reviewer believes that another element should be added to the code, that is, if not "invention," at least "transposition" or "transference." This alone, in his opinion, could explain the representation of dentils under the raking cornice at Ephesus, where they would have no place in fourth-century design, and the antefixes on top of the raking sima normal to the slope, an illogical usage recurring in a barbaric provincial temple at Ciro in South Italy. These, it would seem, were transferred by die-engravers not too familiar with the strict laws of architecture, respectively, from below the horizontal cornice and from the top of the flank sima. By analogy, therefore, we might explain the "arcuated lintels"—which often enframe the heads of cult statues transferred to the façade plane—as the tops of niches or shrines within the respective cellae; and the spirally fluted columns of Samos would fall into the same category. In fact, the "arcuated lintel" is of such general use on coins that one might suspect it as a mere numismatic convention for the enframement of cult statues. Certainly it is difficult to believe, in view of the absence of material remains, that so many of the temples of Asia Minor were rebuilt with arcuated lintels in the second and third centuries A. D.

Most of the small volume (pp. 7-32) is devoted to the documentation of the various details of the fifth ("E" or "Alexander") temple of Artemis at Ephesus both as to its known and its unknown architectural details, with reference to the coins issued by twenty emperors from Claudius to Valerian over a period of more than two centuries (A. D. 41 to 258).<sup>1</sup> This portion is illustrated by reproductions of

<sup>1</sup> There are no references to the coins published by Montfaucon (*op. cit.*, II, 1, pl. 15; suppl. II, pl. 4), nor, with one exception (p. 61), to the studies of Donaldson (*op. cit.*, pp. 21-32, 88-90, 150-152); there are certain items, as the sculptured drums and the pediment openings, on which their opinions might have been cited.

thirty-five different coins and by an architectural elevation drawn by Stuart Shaw (frontispiece). P. 32: the great platform is never accurately represented, showing at most seven equal steps, so that even this inadequate maximum must be an abbreviation; it is to be noted that Shaw's restoration with a vertical podium supported on four steps and crowned by only two, though adding up to the number seven, is not substantiated either by the coins or by the architectural remains. Pp. 29-32: the coins, however, apparently give the final answer to the much disputed question of the *columnae caelatae*, whether those on the façade had two superposed tiers with the sculptured drums on top of the pedestals (Fergusson, Murray, Henderson), or merely sculptured pedestals alone (Lethaby), or merely sculptured drums alone (Wood, Butler, Dinsmoor, Krischen), in that only the last conforms to the representation of a single tier of sculptured cylindrical drums. Pp. 28-29: the dentils resting directly on the architrave, forming the friezeless entablature, generally assumed for the last forty years on the analogy of other temples, are now definitely authenticated by the coins; but the author's statement that these appear only in one type (pl. III, 1) is not literally accurate, since it is obvious that the beading above the architrave in many types is a shorthand representation of dentils. Pp. 10-23: three window-like openings in the pediment, represented on the coins but previously interpreted as tables, altars, or a central door with two altars, are now definitely proved to have been three windows by analogy with other coins (e. g., Baalbek, Magnesia) which reproduce the pediment-windows existing in these very temples, thus corroborating a suggestion made long ago by the reviewer (*A. J. A.*, XIV [1910], p. 151, n. 1) that some special precaution, analogous to the hollowed lintels and pediment opening of the Propylaea at Athens, must have been taken above the central intervals of colossal Ionic temples such as Ephesus. This discovery leads the author to a very interesting accumulation of evidence for such pediment windows (summarized above), supplementing the discussion by D. M. Robinson (*Art Bulletin*, IX [1926], p. 17). Pp. 10-11, 23-27: the pediment sculpture, hitherto only fancifully restored, is represented on coins with a maximum number of four figures alternating with three windows, two figures standing and two reclining, which the author tentatively restores as four Amazons recalling those set up in this sanctuary by four great sculptors of the fifth century (Pliny, XXXIV, 53); but in this respect the reviewer is more doubtful, since both on the coins and in the architectural elevation (frontispiece) the composition appears so parsimonious and meagre as to suggest that the die-engravers here abbreviated as in the matter of the steps. Pp. 10-11, 27-28: a convex disk shown on the coins as suspended from the apex of the raking cornice (analogous to the Spartan shield at Olympia?) is interestingly restored as a Gorgoneion like that on a terracotta tablet from Locri Epizephyrii. Another strange detail of the pediment, shown on many coins but not mentioned by the author (except in passing on p. 5), is represented in Shaw's elevation, namely, the series of antefixes normal to the slope on the top of the raking sima, which, as noted above, the reviewer regards as an instance of transference. It is evident that this careful sifting of the

numismatic evidence has greatly increased our knowledge of one of the seven wonders of the ancient world.

As further demonstration of the usefulness of coins in the identification and restoration of temples, the author shows (pp. 33-35) that the temple appearing on coins of Samos is the actual Ionic Heraeum rather than a Doric peripteral structure erected before it in the imperial period as Schleif assumed; also (pp. 36-39) that four temples combined on coins of Sardis are four different temples rather than four aspects of the single temple of Artemis as Butler had assumed, and (pp. 39-40) that the temple of Asclepius Soter on coins of Pergamum was too large to be identified with the Hellenistic or the Roman structures already excavated, as proposed, respectively, by Deubner and Wiegand. Apparently, moreover, the so-called Serapeum or temple of Claudius at Ephesus was in reality a temple erected for the cult of the emperors in the time of Hadrian (pp. 50-59). By such instances the importance of a comprehensive survey of the numismatic evidence by the architectural investigator is simply vindicated.

A few typographical errors, such as variant spellings of Mme. Paola Zancani-Montuoro's name (pp. 28, 70), the omission of the "o" in Leukophryene (p. 70) or of the "e" in Arkadiane (pl. xxvi), are of minor importance. The twenty-nine plates, more than half displaying coins, are very clearly and adequately reproduced, permitting the reader to test, and in most cases to corroborate, the author's conclusions.

WILLIAM B. DINSMOOR.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

---

GUDEMUND BJÖRCK. *Apsyrtus, Julius Africanus et l'Hippiatrique Grecque*. Uppsala and Leipzig, 1944. Pp. 70. (*Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift*, 1944, No. 4.)

With this book, Björck continues his earlier studies of the *Corpus Hippiatricum* which have contributed so much toward a better understanding of its content and historical significance. His main concerns in his new investigation are chronological and literary problems (chs. I-II), as well as text and tradition of the collection (chs. III-IV).

To start with the latter part of the treatise, Björck shows that the number of Greek manuscripts used by Hoppe and Oder in their authoritative edition can be enlarged; he also surveys Latin and Italian renderings which ought to be considered (pp. 42 ff.). Moreover, he emphasizes the importance of the Arabic tradition. Theonestus' book, lost in the original, seems to have been known to Hunain ibn Ishak who apparently promoted its translation. A re-examination of the Arabic sources should yield interesting results (pp. 36 ff.). It follows that the text as given by Hoppe and Oder cannot be considered final, a fact especially noteworthy in regard to the appreciation of the linguistic and syntactic data which the Hippiatric writings contain (e.g. pp. 52 ff.). Björck himself is fair enough, however, to point out that his findings, including a revaluation of the



history of the collection and of the grouping of its various chapters (pp. 26 ff.), are not likely to invalidate the basic presuppositions of the work done by the last editors of the *Corpus Hippiatricum* (pp. 50 f.).

As regards the chronological questions discussed by Björck (ch. 1), he proposes that Apsyrtus cannot have written after the Danubian campaign of 332-334 A. D., that he must have lived between 150 and 250 A. D., rather than under Constantine the Great, as has been generally assumed on the authority of Suidas (p. 12). The new dating seems to square well with the circumstances that Apsyrtus' language is free of "Byzantine" influences, that none of the official titles of the fourth century occur in his writings, and that the addressees of his letters are not Christians (pp. 11 f.). The new dating would also make it understandable that Theomnestus, who certainly wrote between 313 and 324 A. D. (p. 8), could quote the book of Apsyrtus. Theomnestus' reference to Apsyrtus is indeed the stumbling block for those who follow Suidas. Yet Björck's thesis is acceptable only with the provision that the data furnished by Suidas are not derived from good and independent sources. To me, this seems a rather hazardous assumption, as things stand in the present case, even granted that Suidas' reliability is not beyond doubt. Björck maintains (p. 9) that Suidas has copied the statement concerning Apsyrtus' military service from the beginning of the latter's own book. This may well be true. But where did he find that Apsyrtus was born in Prusa or Nicomedia? According to Björck (p. 9, n. 1), Suidas has culled the names from letters now lost or from incipits now changed, or from the subscription of Apsyrtus' book given in an earlier *Corpus*. The probability of such a hypothesis is not enhanced by the fact that, in the preserved documents, Apsyrtus is introduced as a citizen of Clazomenae (II, p. 96, 23, Oder and Hoppe). Again, one may surmise that Suidas misinterpreted a dedication of Apsyrtus' work, or of a whole *Corpus*, to one of the later Constantines as indicating that Apsyrtus lived under Constantine the Great. It is equally possible that in both instances he simply transcribed a source which used reliable external information. While Apsyrtus' style and vocabulary do not place him in the fourth century, they do not speak against his writing during that period either. And since additions to the text of the *Corpus Hippiatricum* could easily be made and were actually inserted by later compilers, it would be safer, I think, to take Theomnestus' mention of Apsyrtus for an interpolation. For this much has been proved by Björck, that one must either make this assumption or give up the dating based on the article of Suidas. To reconcile both statements, as has recently been tried again by Hoppe (*R.-E.*, Supplement VII, s. v. "Theomnestus"), is an impossible procedure.

Finally, Björck suggests (ch. II) that the *Kestoi* of Julius Africanus are "un pastiche ou bien un véritable travestissement" (p. 25), and although he admittedly feels uncertain whether this characterization should cover the book in its entirety (p. 24), he does not hesitate to compare Julius Africanus with Lucian (p. 23). It is certainly true that some of the passages of the *Kestoi* are not meant to be taken quite seriously (pp. 20 ff.). That this is so, however, hardly

implies that the author intended to parody superstition in general, as did Lucian. Julius Africanus, his good sense and critical judgment notwithstanding, adhered to "superstitious" beliefs, he relished "sacred" books which dealt with mysteries, he enjoyed relating "secret histories" (cf. Kroll, *R.-E.*, s. v., X, cols. 117 f., 120 ff.). The stories on which Björck puts so much emphasis record some of the well known *παλγυα*, that is, practical jokes which are so often referred to in the ancient literature on magic (cf. M. Wellmann, *Abh. Berl. Akad.*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., IV [1921], pp. 31 ff.; Björck, p. 56), and in my opinion it would be a mistake to draw any conclusions from Julius Africanus' mention of these facetious descriptions as to the tenor of the work itself or as to the author's attitude toward superstition. I cannot help expressing the hope that Björck, who has himself written so lucidly on magic in the *Corpus Hippiatricum* (ch. VII, pp. 55 ff.), will reconsider his verdict on Julius Africanus and allow him to be "sensible" and "superstitious" at the same time. Many of Julius' contemporaries were of like hue.

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON.

R. P. FESTUGIÈRE, O.P. *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'Astrologie et les Sciences Occultes.* Paris, J. Gabalda & Co., 1944. Pp. xii + 424.

There has come down to us a collection of theological treatises, known as *Corpus Hermeticum* (or *Poimandres*) and purporting to contain teachings of Hermes Trismegistus, god of wisdom. There are extant, too, many disparate writings attributed to the same divine authorship, which concern astrology and other occult arts. This "hermetic" literature has not yet been treated as a whole. W. Scott in his *Hermetica* purposely ignored "the masses of rubbish" and limited his investigations to the theological writings. Father Festugière's work will cover the whole subject. In the present, first, volume he treats the Hermetic writings on astrology and cognate matters. Since, as he states himself (pp. 82 and 355), the name of Hermes was a mere label, arbitrarily and without discrimination attached to disparate works which might have circulated as well under another name, there is no unity of subject in his book. But that is the sole objection (if any) which the reader may be tempted to advance. For Festugière's book is written according to the best traditions of French scholarship. He is exact without pedantry and presents in a lucid and well-ordered form an astonishing array of detailed and difficult materials. Twenty pages of indices help the reader. Appendices give the Greek text of an alchemist treatise (by Zosimus), the dossier bearing on Cyprian the magician (with the translation of a Coptic version of *Confessio* by Mr. Malinine), and, last but not least, an admirable account of Hermetic literature in Arabic by the master hand of Louis Massignon.

In the middle section of his book, Festugière successively examines

Hermetic writings of astrology (pp. 106-122), those bearing on the relations of herbs and stones to the planets (pp. 160-187), as well as the surviving fragments of alchemist treatises (pp. 240-283), and the texts concerning the magic arts (pp. 287-303). A chapter deals with the so-called "Kiranides," a group of works on magical, particularly medical, efficacy and properties of animals. Composed before 100 A. D., these works widely influenced the bestiaries of the Middle Ages. By translating more important passages, Festugière greatly facilitates the understanding of these abstruse and arid remains of Greek pseudo-science. Nevertheless, I am afraid that even a recipe as to how to pluck sunflowers so as to enable the adept to see at a glance the treasures hidden under the earth (p. 154) will hardly attract the reader. As a matter of fact, all these aberrations are only interesting as testimonies of a historical situation or, as Festugière says (p. 362), as records of "human nature as it was" under the Caesars, or as texts which manifest "the real reasons of life and behaviour" of a period. For this reason, Festugière diligently marks the place of each Hermetic writing in the current of occult thought which carried off the Ancient World under the Roman Empire. For the same reason, he deals with the literary form of the revelation (pp. 309-355), an important contribution to the morphology of religion. He successively treats the revelation in dream, by the word of god, and by other types of direct inspiration; then he studies two forms of conveyance of revelation: admonitions addressed to a king and the instruction given by a father to his son. He stresses the fact (pp. 336, 346, 348, 353) that the idea of the tradition of secret knowledge from father to son (and not from teacher to disciple) is of Oriental, particularly Egyptian, origin. I may add that the moulding of this tradition in epistolary form is Hellenistic (and Greek). As to the revelations by a sage directed to a king, it is hardly necessary to cite here the belief in the divinity of princes (p. 324); in this case the king would be the inspired author himself (cf. p. 325). This type rather follows the Egyptian patterns of didactic works, which are regularly destined for a prince (*Sayings of Ipu-wer, Instructions for Merikere*, etc.).

In the Introduction (pp. 1-89) Festugière deals with the decline of Greek rationalism and the rise of mysticism. He discusses the predilection of late paganism for Oriental revelation and the quest to see the deity face to face, and, coming to Hermetic literature, speaks of its origins and stresses that both classes of Hermetic texts, theological as well as occult, belong to the same milieu and the same spiritual situation.

These are important and difficult questions, and there is room for disagreement. To come to one fundamental point of difference,—for Festugière the success of occult arts and sciences under the Roman Empire is a "perversion of piety." Giving up the rational study of Nature, man asks the deity to grant him as a personal revelation the knowledge he formerly sought to obtain by the force of his intellect (p. 5). To explain this regression toward barbarism, Festugière speaks of the life-blood drained off the wounded body of Hellenism (p. 7) and particularly stresses the fact that the Greek

scientific work lacked experimentation and that Greek rationalism exhausted itself in logomachy (p. 8). But wordy disputations occupied the Greek scientist because the central object of his investigations always remained Man, and not Nature. Like the great French seeker for truth (Malebranche), Greek scholars thought that the most necessary and the most worthy knowledge is that concerning ourselves. As to the weakening of Greek spiritual energy, I venture to think that the emergence of a new (although misleading) way of research can hardly be regarded as a proof of deficiency. Let us imagine ourselves at the beginning of our era and cast our eyes over the results of some five centuries of rational investigation of Nature. The practical result of this investigation is almost nil. The sword of the legionary has conquered the world, but its excellence, stressed by Polybius (VI, 23, 6), owes nothing to Hellenistic science, but much to the art of Spanish blacksmiths. Augustus and not Antony reigns over the world because the small and swift "Liburnae" of the former, constructed after the manner of the barbarian Illyrians, scored at Actium in comparison with Egyptian ships built according to Hellenistic technic. The same sterility of science appears everywhere. Metals were in great demand in the Hellenistic world, but there was hardly any progress in technical devices after Themistocles (M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, II, p. 1219). As to medicine, some Latin author of the first century (I quote from memory, unable to identify the passage), assures us that there is no further possibility of inventing a new drug. Nevertheless, men continued scientific investigations. At the same time that Nigidius Figulus was helping to spread in Italy the occult arts, Philodemus discussed the principles of empirical method (see P. H. DeLacy and E. A. DeLacy, *Philodemus, On Methods of Inference* [1941]). When the false prophet Alexander of Abonutichos was exercising his tricks, Galen performed vivisections in public to show the function of the brain and spinal cord in the nervous system, while the great Ptolemy discussed refraction and the relation between the eye and light. A contemporary of Apollonius of Tyana, Menelaos of Alexandria, published the first work on spherical trigonometry, while others at the same time were enthusiastic about geographical discoveries. *O quantum terrae, quantum cognoscere caeli permissum est. Pelagus quantos aperimus in usum* (Valerius Flaccus, *Argon.*, I, 168).

But the empirical and positivistic approach led at best to a rather uncertain probability, as Philodemus states. Mathematics alone offered reliable and certain knowledge and accordingly was extended in an unbroken tradition until the time of Newton. The weakness of ancient experimental science, which suffered most severely from the lack of continuance in research (see O. Neugebauer, *Journ. Near East. Stud.*, 1945, p. 19), had as its background the poverty of the ancient world. There was no keen competition or over-production in agriculture or industry, no need for mass production, but a plentiful supply of cheap labor,—all the factors which excluded want of and demand for technical improvements (Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, II, p. 1237). Thus, tired of the inefficiency of official science, men turned to the occult arts. They hoped to find here a

"short-cut" to practical results (so in astrology, alchemy, etc.), since here the researcher came in contact with the cause of things, the divinity, and since, according to Greek (Platonic) principle, the arts which rest on empirical observation are of little value. True science is based on knowledge of causes.

Festugière (p. 316) places on the same level the search for truth and the Oriental revelation in ecstatic trance. But in the latter case man is passive, while an adept of the Hermetics worked to acquire the knowledge. As Seneca says (*De Ben.*, IV, 8, 1), the universal deity is called Mercurius (Hermes), *quia ratio penes illum est numerusque et ordo et scientia*. Accordingly, Hermes Trismegistus prescribes for his adepts the forcing of the knowledge: "think that for you nothing is impossible . . . bid your soul fly heavenward." That is the Greek idea of climbing up by one's own endeavour. Aristophanes had earlier ridiculed the dithyrambic souls who floated in air looking for odes (Aristophanes, *Pax*, 828). Misdirected as they were, the paths trodden by the Greek occultists aimed at the conquest of Nature. For this reason, these efforts were regarded with misgiving by pious souls (cf. L. Delatte, *L'Ant. Class.*, 1935, p. 309).

ELIAS J. BICKERMAN.

ÉCOLE LIBRE DES HAUTES ÉTUDES, NEW YORK.

---

EIRIK VANDVIK. *National Admixture in Medieval Latin*. Reprinted from *Symbolae Osloenses*, XXIII (1944), pp. 81-101.

This is a useful survey of Old Norwegian (sometimes German) loanwords, loan-translations, and loan idioms that are to be found in Latin writings of Old Norwegian authors.

After a short introduction the author first takes up "Proper Names and Technical Terms," that being the most conspicuous category, then "Some substrata of the Common Vocabulary," then "Vernacular Features in the Syntax," and finally "The Substrata and the Writers' Nationality."

A few notes are here in order. On pp. 82-83 the author compares *insula pertinet ad regem Norwegie, ita quod non habet ibi aliquis nisi solus rex Norwegie* with *Innþræendr hq̄ðu fjolmennt á Mærinni*, but the cases are not quite comparable; *hafa* in the sense of "possess" always seems to need an object, except in the phrase *hafa í seli* "keep (animals) at the shieling."

On p. 85 it is noted that a bishop of the Faroes added "a curious termination to the national stem" of *rúnar*. The word is *Malrunen* (*málrúnar*) and the termination seems to be German. There are more instances of German elements in these Latin writings.

On p. 89 the author discusses *norici* in the sense "inhabitants of the North of Norway" (the usual sense of *norici* being: "Northmen, Norwegians"). To prove his point—which cannot be disputed—he says that *norðmenn* was used in Iceland about the inhabitants of North Iceland. Now this term is actually found once—in a verse



from 1231—while the usual terms for that sense are *norðlendingr* or *norðanmaðr* ("Northlander," "man from the North"). I am inclined to think that *norðmenn* was formed *ad hoc* to fit the verse line.

On the origin of *lingua materna* (p. 94) Professor Spitzer has other ideas (*Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht*, XXXVI, pp. 113 ff.), but it occurs apparently first in the *Historia de antiquitate regum Norwagensium* by Theodricus monachus.

On p. 96 though the author prints *consulimus* (pro *suadimus*!) he does not expressly point out the Old Norse verb substratum *ráða*, which he has in mind.

STEFÁN EINARSSON.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Alexander (William Hardy). *Cato of Utica in the Works of Seneca Philosophus*. Reprinted from *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Third Series, Section II, Volume XL (1946), pp. 59-74.

Amatucci (Aurelio G.). *La Letteratura di Roma Imperiale*. Bologna, *Licinio Cappelli Editore*, 1947. Pp. xvi + 421; 9 pls. (*Istituto di Studi Romani, Storia di Roma*, XXV.)

Boesch (B.), editor. *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Grundzügen. Die Epochen Deutscher Dichtung*. In *Darstellungen von L. Beriger, A. Bettex, B. Boesch, W. Burkhard, E. Ermatinger, F. Ranke, F. Strich, M. Wehrli, A. Zäch*. Bern, *A. Francke Ag. Verlag*, 1946. Pp. 363. 14.80 Swiss fr.

Bos (Isaac). *Plutarchus' Leven van Agesilaus*. Inleiding, Tekst, Commentaar. Groningen, *J. B. Wolters' Uitgevers-Maatschappij*, 1947. Pp. xxx + 227. (Diss., Univ. of Amsterdam.)

Boyce (Aline Abaecherli). *Coins of Tingi with Latin Legends*. New York, *American Numismatic Society*, 1947. Pp. 27; 5 pls. (*Numismatic Notes and Monographs*, 109.)

Brennan (Sister M. Josephine). *A Study of the Clausulae in the Sermons of St. Augustine*. Washington, D. C., *Catholic Univ. of America Press*, 1947. Pp. xviii + 126. (*Patristic Studies*, LXXVII.)

Casey (Robert P.). *The Armenian Version of the Pseudo-Athanasian Letter to the Antiochenes and of the Expositio Fidei, Part I*. London, *Christophers*; Philadelphia, *Univ. of Pennsylvania Press*, 1947. Pp. ix + 78. \$4.00. (*Studies and Documents*, edited by Kirsopp Lake, Silva Lake, Carsten Höeg, XV.)

Casey (Robert P.). *The De Incarnatione of Athanasius, Part 2: The Short Recension*. London, *Christophers*; Philadelphia, *Univ. of Pennsylvania Press*, 1946. Pp. 1 + 86. \$4.00. (*Studies and Documents*, edited by Kirsopp and Silva Lake, XIV.)

Castiglioni (L.) and Sabbadini (Remigius), editors. *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica*, Georgica. Turin, *Paravia*, 1945. Pp. xvii + 160. 100 lire. (*Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum*.)

Castiglioni (L.) and Sabbadini (Remigius), editors. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri XII*. Editio ad exemplum editionis Romanae

(MCMXXX) emendata. Libri I-XII. In four volumes. Turin, *Paravia*, 1945. Pp. xxii + 445. 580 lire. (*Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum*.)

Cazzaniga (Egnatius), editor. Catulli Veronensis Liber. Turin, *Paravia*, 1945. Pp. xv + 167. 180 lire. (*Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum*.)

Ciaffi (Vincenzo). Lettura di Tibullo. Turin, *Chiantore*, 1944. Pp. 191.

Creaghan (John S., S. J.) and Raubitschek (A. E.). Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens. Foreword by Benjamin D. Meritt. Woodstock, Md., *Theological Studies*, 1947. Pp. vii + 54; 10 pls. \$2.50. (Reprinted from *Hesperia*, XVI.)

Cross (Tom Peete). Bibliographical Guide to English Studies. Ninth Edition with an Index. Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1947. Pp. x + 74. \$1.00.

Cruttwell (Robert W.). Virgil's Mind at Work. An Analysis of the Symbolism of the Aeneid. Oxford, *Blackwell*; New York, *Macmillan*, 1947. Pp. ix + 182. \$2.50.

Cupaiuolo (Fabio). L'Epistola di Orazio ai Pisoni. Naples, *Casa Editrice Rondinella Alfredo*, 1941. Pp. 116.

Cupaiuolo (Fabio). L'Esaltazione delle Virtù Patrie nella Storia di Livio. Naples, *Casa Editrice Rondinella Alfredo*, 1942. Pp. 17.

Cupaiuolo (Fabio). A Proposito della callida iunctura Oraziana. Naples, *Arti Grafiche Torella*, 1942. Pp. 26.

Edsman (Carl-Martin). Le Baptême de Feu. Uppsala, *Lundequistska*; Leipzig, *Alfred Lorentz*, 1940. Pp. 237. (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, IX.) (Obtainable from the author, Sandgatan 4, Lund, Sweden.)

Edsman (Carl-Martin). The Body and Eternal Life. Stockholm, *Svenska Kurkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag*, 1946. Pp. 104. (*Mélanges Johs. Pedersen*, I, Fasc. II.) (*Horae Soederblomianae* [Travaux publiés par la Société Nathan Söderblom].)

Ehrenberg (Victor). Aspects of the Ancient World. Essays and Reviews. New York, *William Salloch*, 1946. Pp. ix + 256; 4 pls. \$4.50.

Ernout (Alfred). Philologica. Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1946. Pp. vi + 233. 600 fr. (*Études et Commentaires*, I.)

Eumusia. Festgabe für Ernst Howald zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 20. April 1947. Erlench-Zürich, *Eugen Rentsch*, 1947. Pp. 207. 13.80 fr.

Fournier (H.). Les Verbes "Dire" en Grec Ancien (Exemple de Conjugaison Supplétive). Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1946. Pp. xii + 234. 600 fr. (*Collection Linguistique publiée par La Société de Linguistique de Paris*, LI.)

Galli (Umberto). Platone, Il Simposio. Turin, *Chiantore*, 1944 [1935]. Pp. cxliv + 242. 60 lire. (*Biblioteca di Filologia Classica*.)

Georgiev (Vladimir). Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft. Erste Lieferung. Sofia, *Universitätsdruckerei*, 1941. Pp. 162. (*Jahrbuch der Universität Sveti Kliment Ohridski in Sofia*, XXXVI, 6.)

Georgiev (Vladimir). Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft. Zweite Lieferung. Sofia, *Imprimerie de l'Université*, 1945. Pp. 163-240. (*Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia*, XLI.)

Glinz (Hans). Geschichte und Kritik der Lehre von den Satzgliedern in der deutschen Grammatik. Bern, *A. Francke Ag. Verlag*, 1947. Pp. 83. 6.80 Swiss fr.

Handford (S. A.). The Latin Subjunctive. Its Usage and Develop-

ment from Plautus to Tacitus. London, *Methuen*, 1947. Pp. 184. 10s. 6d.

Hanell (Krister). *Das Altrömische Eponyme Amt*. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1946. Pp. 226. (*Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom*, II.)

Hansen (Esther V.). *The Attalids of Pergamon*. Ithaca, *Cornell Univ. Press*, 1947. Pp. xxxvi + 464; map. \$4.50. (*Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*, XXIX.)

Jones (W. H. S.). *Philosophy and Medicine in Ancient Greece*. With an Edition of *Περὶ ἀρχαῖς ἱερικῆς*. Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1946. Pp. v + 100. \$2.00 (to subscribers to the *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, \$1.75). (*Supplements to the Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 8.)

Lambert (André). *Die indirekte Rede als künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius*. Zürich, *Buckdruckerei Baublatt Ag., Rüschlikon*, 1946. Pp. 80. (Diss.)

Lehmann (Phyllis Williams). *Statues on Coins of Southern Italy and Sicily in the Classical Period*. New York, *H. Bittner and Co.*, 1946. Pp. ii + 72; 12 text figs.; 15 pls. \$3.50. (*Institute of Fine Arts, New York University*.)

Lejeune (Michel). *Traité de Phonétique Grecque*. Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1947. Pp. xvi + 358. 600 fr. (*Collection de Philologie Classique*, III.)

Llubera (Ig. González). *Santob de Carrión. Proverbios Morales*. Edited with an Introduction. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1947. Pp. xii + 162. \$4.50.

Lowe (E. A.), editor. *Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*. Part IV: Italy: Perugia-Verona. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1947. Pp. xxviii + 40; manuscript facsimiles. \$28.00.

Marmorale (Enzo V.). *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis*. Testo critico e commento. Firenze, "*La Nuova Italia*" Editrice, 1947. Pp. xviii + 179. (*Biblioteca di Studi Superiori Filol. Lat.*, I.)

Martinazzoli (Folco). *Ethos ed Eros nella Poesia Greca*. Firenze, "*La Nuova Italia*" Editrice, [1947?]. Pp. 503. 450 lire. (*Biblioteca di Cultura*, 27.)

Moore (J. A.). *Selections from the Greek Elegiac, Iambic, and Lyric Poets*. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*; London, *Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford Univ. Press*, 1947. Pp. v + 112.

Ninck (Martin). *Die Entdeckung von Europa durch die Griechen*. Basel, *Benno Schwabe and Co.*, 1945 (American representative: Albert J. Phiebig, Suite 1209, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.). Pp. 287.

Nock (A. D.) and Festugière (A.-J.). *Corpus Hermeticum, Traités I-XVIII. Texte établi et traduit*. Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres"*, 1945. Pp. liv + 405. (*Collection des Universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé*.)

Paratore (Ettore). *Virgilio, Eneide, Libro Quarto*. Rome, *Casa Editrice Gismondi*, 1947. Pp. xlvii + 167. 280 lire. (*Convivium, Collana di Autori Greci e Latini*, IV.)

Paratore (Ettore). *Una Nuova Ricostruzione del "De Poetis" di Suetonio*. Rome, *Casa Editrice Gismondi*, 1946. Pp. 304. 550 lire.

Paratore (Ettore). *Lucrezio (nel Bimillenario della Morte)*. *Istituto di Studi Romani, Editore*, 1946. Pp. 31. 50 lire.

Percy (Ernst). *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1946. Pp. xvii + 517. (*Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund*, XXXIX.)

Pesaresi (Raimondo). Erodoto, Le Storie. Passi scelti e commenti. Rome, *Casa Editrice Gismondi*, 1946. Pp. xl + 137. 275 lire. *Convivium, Collana di Autori Greci e Latini*, III.)

Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.). The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1946. Pp. xvi + 288; 141 illustrations; 3 plans at end; frontispiece.

Rand (E. K.), Smith (H. T.), Savage (J. J.), Waldrop (G. B.), Elder (J. P.), Peebles (B. M.), Stocker (A. F.), editors. Servianorum in Vergilii Carmina Commentariorum, Editionis Harvardianae, Vol. II, quod in Aeneidos Libros I et II Explanationes continet. Lancaster, Pa., *Lancaster Press*, 1946. Pp. xxi + 509. \$5.00. (*Special Publication of the American Philological Association*.)

Reichenbach (Hans). Elements of Symbolic Logic. New York, *Macmillan*, 1947. Pp. xiii + 444; 9 figs. \$5.00.

Révész (G.). Ursprung und Vorgeschichte der Sprache. Bern, A. Francke, 1946. Pp. 279. 19 Swiss fr.

Robinson (Charles Alexander, Jr.). Alexander the Great. The Meeting of East and West in World Government and Brotherhood. New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1947. Pp. 252; frontispiece; end-paper map. \$3.75.

Robinson (David M.). Baalbek. Palmyra. Photographs by Hoyningen-Huene. New York, *J. J. Augustin Publishers*, 1946. Pp. 136; 2 plans; 55 photographs. \$7.50.

Rodhe (Sten). Deliver us from Evil. Studies on the Vedic Ideas of Salvation. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup; Copenhagen, *Ejnar Munksgaard*, 1946. Pp. 207. (*Publications by the Swedish Society for Missionary Research*, 2.)

de Romilly (Jacqueline). Thucydide et L'Impérialisme Athénien. La pensée de l'historien et la genèse de l'oeuvre. Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres"*, 1947. Pp. 326. 700 fr. (*Collection des Études Anciennes publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé*.)

Sanders (Henry A.), editor, with contributions by James E. Dunlap. Latin Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection. Ann Arbor, *Univ. of Michigan Press*; London, *Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford Univ. Press*, 1947. Pp. xiv + 126; 18 pls. \$5.00. (*University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, XLVIII; *Michigan Papyri*, VII.)

Schulz (Fritz). History of Roman Legal Science. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1946. Pp. xvi + 346.

Sedgwick (Henry Dwight). Horace. A Biography. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1947. Pp. xi + 182.

Singer (Charles) and Rabin (C.). A Prelude to Modern Science, being a discussion of the history, sources and circumstances of the *Tabulae Anatomicae Sex* of Vesalius. Cambridge, *University Press* (published for the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum), 1947. Pp. lxxxvi + 58; 59 figs.; 6 pls. 50s. (*Publications of the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum [New Series]*, I.)

Sluiter (T. H.). L. Annaei Senecae Oedipus. Specimen Editionis Criticae. Groningen, *M. de Waal*, 1941. Pp. 126. (Diss.)

Snell (Bruno). Die Entdeckung des Geistes. Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen. Hamburg, *Claaszen und Goyerts Verlag*, 1946. Pp. 264.

Spitzbarth (Anna). Untersuchungen zur Spieltechnik der Griechischen Tragödie. Zürich, *Rhein-Verlag*, 1946. Pp. 109. 7 fr.

Stein (Arthur). Die Reichsbeamten von Dazien. Budapest, *Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetem Erem- és Régiségtani Intézete*; Leipzig, *Otto Harrassowitz*, 1944. Pp. 131. (*Dissertationes Pannonicae ex Instituto*

*Numismatico et Archaeologico Universitatis de Petro Pázmány Nominatae Budapestinensis Provenientes*, Ser. I, No. 12.)

Stone (Robert C.). *The Language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae*. With an Index Verborum. Urbana, *Univ. of Illinois Press*, 1946. Pp. 199. (*Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, XXX, Nos. 2-3.)

Strömberg (Reinhold). *Damascius, his Personality and Significance*. Göteborg, *Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag*, 1946. (Reprinted from *Eranos Rudbergianus* (*Eranos*, XLIV), pp. 175-192.)

Strömberg (Reinhold). *Greek Prefix Studies on the Use of Adjective Particles*. Göteborg, *Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag*, 1946. Pp. 204. 20 kr. (*Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift*, LII.)

Sturtevant (Edgar H.). *An Introduction to Linguistic Science*. New Haven, *Yale Univ. Press*; London, *Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford Univ. Press*, 1947. Pp. 173. \$3.00.

Symbolae van Oven. *Symbolae ad Jus et Historiam Antiquitatis Pertinentes Julio Christiano van Oven Dedicatae*. Edd. M. David, B. A. van Groningen, E. M. Meijers. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*, 1946. Pp. viii + 410; 4 pls.; frontispiece.

Terracini (Benvenuto). *Perfiles de Lingüistas. Contribución a la Historia de la Lingüística Comparada*. Tucumán, Argentina, *Universidad Nacional de Tucumán*, 1946. Pp. 145. (*Universidad Nacional de Tucumán Facultad Filosofía y Letras, Cuadernos de Letras*, 4.)

Thiel (J. H.). *Studies on the History of Roman Sea-Power in Republican Times*. Amsterdam, *North-Holland Publishing Company*, 1946. Pp. vi + 456. 25 fl.

Thomsen (Rudi). *The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion*. Copenhagen, *Glydendal*, 1947. Pp. 339 + vi (Danish résumé); 8 pls. (maps). (*Classica et Mediaevalia*, Dissertationes IV.)

Vallejo (Jose). *Tito Livio, Libro XXI. Edición, Estudio Preliminar y Comentario*. Con un índice de las notas gramaticales, mapas y otros grabados. Madrid, *Instituto "Antonio de Nebrija"*, 1946. Pp. cxx + 157; 8 photographs; 5 text figs.; 12 maps and diagrams.

Van den Bruwaene (Martin). *Études sur Cicéron*. Bruxelles, *L'Édition Universelle, S.A.*, 1946. Pp. 111.

Van Ooteghem (J., S. J.). *Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina, à l'usage des professeurs des humanités gréco-latines*. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée. Brussels, *Éditions de la Revue "Les Études Classiques"*. Pp. 387.

Van Sicke (C. E.). *A Political and Cultural History of the Ancient World from Prehistoric Times to the Dissolution of the Roman Empire in the West, Vol. I: The Orient and Greece to the Partition of the Empire of Alexander the Great*. Boston, *Houghton Mifflin Co.*, 1947. Pp. xvii + 630; illustrations and maps. \$4.50. (Edited by W. S. Ferguson and T. A. Brady.)

Webster (T. B. L.). *Restorations in Menander*. Manchester, *University Press*, 1946. Pp. 31. 18 d. (Reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. XXX, No. 1.)

Wikgren (Allen), with the collaboration of Ernst Cadman Colwell and Ralph Marcus. *Hellenistic Greek Texts*. Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1947. Pp. xxvi + 275. \$3.50.

Wild (John D.). *Plato's Theory of Man. An Introduction to the Realistic Philosophy of Culture*. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1946. Pp. x + 320. \$5.00.

Wilkin (Robert N.). *Eternal Lawyer: A Legal Biography of Cicero*. New York, *Macmillan Company*, 1947. Pp. xvi + 264. \$3.00.



# INDEX TO VOLUME LXVIII.

	PAGE		PAGE
Alleius Nigidius Maius, Gnaeus, of Pompeii,	382-393	ELDER, JOHN P. Catullus' <i>Attis</i> ,	394-403
Aristotle's Four Species of Tragedy ( <i>Poetics</i> 18) and their Importance for Dra- matic Criticism,	363-381	Elegy, The First, of Solon,	161-179
Aristotle's Presuppositions about Change,	404-413	Eleusinio, Echi del Rito, in Euripide,	82-86
Asinius Pollio, The Descen- dants of,	147-160	Etymology (The) of "Botar- go,"	414-418
Athenian (An) Treaty with an Unknown State,	312-315	Euripide, Echi del Rito Eleu- sinio in,	82-86
Attic (The) Archons Diokles- Timarchos,	195-198	Euripides' <i>Ion</i> , 1561,	86-87
BICKERMAN, ELIAS J. Syria and Cilicia,	353-362	FRÄNKEL, HERMANN. Note on the Closing Sections of Pseudo-Xenophon's <i>Con- stitution of the Athe- nians</i> ,	309-312
BOAS, GEORGE. Aristotle's Presuppositions about Change,	404-413	GILBERT, ALLAN H. Aris- totle's Four Species of Tragedy ( <i>Poetics</i> 18) and their Importance for Dra- matic Criticism,	363-381
BOOKS RECEIVED,	223-224, 336, 449-453	HOENIGSWALD, H. M. On Varro, <i>De Lingua Latina</i> , V, 15,	198-199
"Botargo," The Etymology of,	414-418	HONEYMAN, A. M. <i>Varia Pu- nica</i> ,	77-82
Catullus' <i>Attis</i> ,	394-403	Horace's First Roman Ode,	337-352
Change, Aristotle's Presup- positions about,	404-413	HUGHES, JOHN P. The Ety- mology of "Botargo" (with R. GORDON WAS- SON),	414-418
CHERNISS, HAROLD. Some War-Time Publications concerning Plato,	113- 146, 225-265	Italy, Classical, The Negro in,	266-292
Cilicia and Syria,	353-362	Italy, War-Time Productivity in,	1-20
Claudian's <i>In Rufinum</i> , Two Notes on,	64-73	JAEGER, WERNER. On Diony- sius of Halicarnassus, <i>Ad Ammaeum</i> , 4,	315-316
CLAUSEN, WENDELL. Notes on Sallust's <i>Historiae</i> ,	293-301	Julio-Claudian Emperors, The Personality of the Mints under the,	47-63
<i>Constitution of the Athenians</i> , Pseudo-Xenophon's Note on the Closing Sections of,	309-312	LATTIMORE, RICHMOND. The First Elegy of Solon,	161-179
Descendants (The) of Asinius Pollio,	147-160	LAVAGNINI, BRUNO. Echi del Rito Eleusinio in Euri- pide,	82-86
Diokles-Timarchos, The Attic Archons,	195-198		
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, <i>Ad Ammaeum</i> , 4, On,	315-316		
Dragon (The) on the Trea- sure,	302-309		
EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT,	87		

- |   | PAGE             |   | PAGE    |
|---|------------------|---|---------|
| LEVY, HARRY L. Two Notes on Claudian's <i>In Rufinum</i> ,                                | 64-73            | Familiar Statuary in Rome (MARGARETE BIEBER),   | 88-92   |
| Lucretius, Progress and Primitivism in,   | 180-194          | <i>Chantraine's</i> Grammaire homérique (phonétique et morphologie) (ROLAND G. KENT),   | 106-108 |
| MCDIARMID, JOHN B. Euripides' <i>Ion</i> , 1561,  | 86-87            | <i>Cherniss' The Riddle of the Early Academy</i> (RICHARD ROBINSON),  | 325-327 |
| MERITT, BENJAMIN D. An Athenian Treaty with an Unknown State,                             | 312-315          | <i>Cohen's</i> La Grèce et l'Hellénisation du monde antique, nouvelle édition (STERLING DOW),   | 98-100  |
| The Attic Archons Diokles-Timarchos,  | 195-198          | <i>Collart's</i> Les Papyrus Théodore Reinach, Tome II (C. BRADFORD WELLES),  | 93-98   |
| Mints under the Julio-Claudian Emperors, The Personality of the,                          | 47-63            | <i>DeLacy's</i> Philodemus: On Methods of Inference. A Study in Ancient Empiricism. Edited with translation and commentary (ERNST KAPP),        | 320-325 |
| Naevius' <i>Bellum Punicum</i> , The Original Form of,                                    | 21-46            | <i>Düring's</i> Aristotle's <i>De Partibus Animalium</i> : Critical and Literary Commentaries (L. A. POST),                                     | 105-106 |
| Negro (The) in Classical Italy,   | 266-292          | <i>Dunkin's</i> Post-Aristophanic Comedy. Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at both Athens and Rome (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH), | 419-426 |
| NILSSON, MARTIN P. The Dragon on the Treasure,  | 302-309          | <i>Edelstein's</i> Asclepius, Vol. I: Testimonies; Vol. II: Interpretations (MARTIN P. NILSSON),  | 215-219 |
| OLIVER, JAMES H. The Descendants of Asinius Pollio,                                       | 147-160          | <i>Festugière's</i> Épicure et ses Dieux (NORMAN W. DE WITT),   | 317-320 |
| Original (The) Form of Naevius' <i>Bellum Punicum</i> ,                                   | 21-46            | <i>Festugière's</i> La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'Astrologie et les Sciences Occultes (ELIAS J. BICKERMAN),                          | 445-448 |
| Personality (The) of the Mints under the Julio-Claudian Emperors,                         | 47-63            | <i>Jaeger's</i> <i>Paideia</i> , The Ideals of Greek Culture, Vols. I-III (G. M. A. GRUBE),   | 200-215 |
| Plato, Some War-Time Publications concerning,   | 113-146, 225-265 | <i>Jasny's</i> The Wheats of Classical Antiquity (G. RAYNOR THOMPSON),  | 438-440 |
| Pompeii, Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius of,  | 382-393          | <i>Kerényi's</i> Hermes der Seelenführer: Das Mythologem vom männlichen Lebensursprung (MARY ANN TIBBETTS),                                     | 327-330 |
| PRENTICE, WILLIAM K. The mistogenes of Syracuse, An Error of a Copyist,                   | 73-77            |   |         |
| Progress and Primitivism in Lucretius,  | 180-194          |   |         |
| Pseudo-Xenophon's <i>Constitution of the Athenians</i> , Note on the Closing Sections of, | 309-312          |   |         |
| Punica Varia,   | 77-82            |   |         |
| REVIEWS:  |                  |   |         |
| <i>Bassett's</i> The Poetry of Homer (ALBERT BATES LORD),                                 | 219-222          |   |         |
| <i>Björck's</i> Apsyrtus, Julius Africanus et l'Hippiatrique Grecque (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN),  | 443-445          |   |         |
| <i>Carpenter's</i> Observations on  |                  |   |         |

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Marouzeau</i> , see <i>Mémorial des Études latines</i> .		ROWELL, HENRY T. The Original Form of Naevius' <i>Bellum Punicum</i> ,	21-46
<i>Mémorial des Études latines</i> , publié à l'occasion du vingtième anniversaire de la Société et de la Revue des Études latines, offert par la Société à son fondateur J. Marouzeau (ROLAND G. KENT),	108-109	Sallust's <i>Historiae</i> , Notes on,	293-301
<i>Newell's</i> The Byzantine Hoard of Lagbe (PAUL A. CLEMENT),	426-432	SNOWDEN, FRANK M., JR. The Negro in Classical Italy,	266-292
<i>Norberg's</i> "Faire faire quelque chose à quelqu'un." Recherches sur l'origine latine de la construction romane (ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER),	110-112	SOLMSSEN, FRIEDRICH. Horace's First Roman Ode,	337-352
<i>Norberg's</i> L'Olympionique, le Poète, et leur renom éternel. Contribution à l'étude de l'ode I, 1 d'Horace (GILBERT NORWOOD),	432-435	Solon, The First Elegy of,	161-179
<i>Norwood's</i> Pindar (DAVID M. ROBINSON),	332-334	SUTHERLAND, C. H. V. The Personality of the Mints under the Julio-Claudian Emperors,	47-63
<i>Ros'</i> De Beteekenis van de Rhetorica in de Oudheid (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH),	334-335	Syria and Cilicia,	353-362
<i>Stoessl's</i> Der Tod des Herakles: Arbeitsweise und Formen der Antiken Sagedichtung (H. M. HUBBELL),	330-331	TAYLOR, MARGARET. Progress and Primitivism in Lucetius,	180-194
<i>Trell's</i> The Temple of Artemis at Ephesos (WILLIAM B. DINSMOOR),	440-443	Themistogenes of Syracuse, An Error of a Copyist,	73-77
<i>Ugolini's</i> L'Acropoli di Butrinto (JAMES H. OLIVER),	101-105	Timarchos-Diokles, The Attic Archons,	195-198
<i>Vandvik's</i> Genetivus und Ablativus Qualitatis (JAMES WILSON POULTNEY),	100-101	Tragedy, Aristotle's Four Species of ( <i>Poetics</i> 18), and their Importance for Dramatic Criticism,	363-381
<i>Vandvik's</i> National Admixture in Medieval Latin (STEFÁN EINARSSON),	448-449	Treasure, The Dragon on the,	302-309
<i>Wagner's</i> Rufinus, the Translator: A Study of his Theory and his Practice as illustrated in his Version of the <i>Apologetica</i> of St. Gregory Nazianzen (WILLIAM C. BARK),	435-438	Treaty, An Athenian, with an Unknown State,	312-315
		VAN BUREN, A. W. Gnaeus Alleius Nigidius Maius of Pompeii,	382-393
		War-Time Productivity in Italy,	1-20
		Varia Punica,	77-82
		Varro, <i>De Lingua Latina</i> , V, 15, On,	198-199
		War-Time Productivity in Italy,	1-20
		War-Time Publications concerning Plato, Some,	113-146, 225-265
		WASSON, R. GORDON. The Etymology of "Botargo" (with JOHN P. HUGHES),	414-418

# THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ARCHAEOLOGY

EDITED BY DAVID M. ROBINSON

1. The Roman Toga. By Lillian M. Wilson. 132 pages. 102 illustrations. \$5.00.
2. The History and Civilization of Ancient Megara. By E. L. Highbarger. 234 pages. 6 illustrations. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.
3. Ancient Sicyon with a Prosopographia Sicyonia. By Charles H. Skalet. 234 pages. 17 illustrations. \$2.50.
4. The Negro in Greek and Roman Civilization: A Study of the Ethiopian Type. By Grace Hadley Beardsley. 154 pages. 24 illustrations. Out of print.
5. Les Cultes de Patras: Avec une Prosopographie Patréenne. By Jules Herbillon. 199 pages. \$3.00.
6. Excavations at Olynthus. Part I. The Neolithic Settlement. By George E. Mylonas. 126 pages. 96 plates. \$7.50.
7. The Greek Tradition in Sculpture. By Walter R. Agard. 70 pages. 34 illustrations. \$3.00.
8. Ancient Corinth, with a Topographical Sketch of the Corinthia. Part I. From the Earliest Times to 404 B. C. By J. G. O'Neill. 270 pages. 9 plates and large folded plan of excavations. \$5.00.
9. Excavations at Olynthus. Part II. Architecture and Sculpture. By David M. Robinson. 177 pages. 315 illustrations. \$20.00.
10. Papyri in the Princeton University Collections. Edited by Allan Chester Johnson and Henry Bartlett van Hoesen. 169 pages. \$7.50.
11. Excavations at Olynthus. Part III. The Coins Found at Olynthus. By David M. Robinson. 143 pages. 28 plates. \$10.00.
12. Excavations at Olynthus. Part IV. The Terra-Cottas Found at Olynthus. By David M. Robinson. 119 pages. 62 plates. \$10.00.
13. Sculptured Portraits of Greek Statesmen: With a Special Study of Alexander the Great. By Elmer G. Suhr. 202 pages. 21 plates. \$4.50.
14. Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt. By Grace Harriet Macurdy. 265 pages. 12 plates. \$4.00.
15. Early Civilization in Thessaly. By Hazel D. Hansen. 222 pages. 178 illustrations. \$4.00.
16. Old Age Among the Ancient Greeks. By Bessie Ellen Richardson. 391 pages. 16 plates. \$4.00.
17. A History of Olynthus. By Mabel Gude. 122 pages. \$2.50.
18. Excavations at Olynthus. Part V. Mosaics, Vases, and Lamps of Olynthus found in 1928 and 1931. By David M. Robinson. 320 pages. 209 plates. \$15.00.
19. Excavations at Olynthus. Part VI. The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1931. By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. 30 plates. \$10.00.
20. Excavations at Olynthus. Part VII. The Terra-Cottas of Olynthus Found in 1931. By David M. Robinson. 123 pages. 61 plates. \$10.00.
21. Pindar: A Poet of Eternal Ideas. By David M. Robinson. 186 pages. \$3.00.
22. Vassal-Queens and Some Contemporary Women under the Roman Empire. By Grace H. Macurdy. 160 pages. 6 plates. \$3.00.
23. A Study of the Greek Love-Names, Including a Discussion of Paederasty and a Prosopographia. By David M. Robinson and Edward J. Fluck. 212 pages. 1 plate. \$3.00.
24. The Clothing of the Ancient Romans. By Lillian M. Wilson. 191 pages. 118 illustrations. \$5.00.
25. Excavations at Olynthus. Part VIII. The Hellenic House. By David M. Robinson and J. Walter Graham. 391 pages. 36 figures and 111 plates. \$15.00.
26. Excavations at Olynthus. Part IX. The Chalcidic Mint and the Excavation Coins Found in 1928-1934. By David M. Robinson and Paul Augustus Clement. 446 pages. 36 plates. \$15.00.
27. The Ape in Antiquity. By William C. McDermott. 349 pages. 10 plates. \$5.00.
28. Etruscan Perugia. By Chandler Shaw. 115 pages. 16 plates. \$2.75.
29. The Common People of Pompeii: A Study of the Graffiti. By Helen H. Tanzer. 113 pages. 49 illustrations. \$3.00.
30. The Gates of Dreams. An Archaeological Examination of Vergil, *Aeneid* VI, 893-899. By E. L. Highbarger. 149 pages. 15 illustrations. \$3.00.
31. Excavations at Olynthus. Part X. Metal and Minor Miscellaneous Finds. An Original Contribution to Greek Life. By David M. Robinson. 610 pages. 33 figures. 171 plates. 1 map. \$20.00.
32. Excavations at Olynthus. Part XI. Necrolynthia. A Study in Greek Burial Customs and Anthropology. By David M. Robinson. 307 pages. 26 figures. 70 plates. 1 map. \$15.00.
33. Two Currents in the Thought-Stream of Europe: A History of Opposing Points of View. By Elmer G. Suhr. 468 pages. \$5.00.
34. The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks. By William A. McDonald. 324 pages. 31 figures. 19 plates. \$5.00.
35. The Horse in Greek Art. By Sidney David Markman. 223 pages. 62 figures on plates. \$5.00.
36. Excavations at Olynthus. Part XII. (With Excursus I on Pebble Mosaics with Colored Plates, Excursus II on the Oecus Unit, Testimonia, List of Greek Words, etc.). By David M. Robinson. 549 pages. 12 figures and 272 plates, 10 colored plates. \$30.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

# An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome

- I. *Rome and Italy of the Republic.* By TENNEY FRANK. 445 pages. Now out of print.
  - II. *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian.* By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON. 742 pages. Now out of print.
  - III. *The Four Western Provinces.* By R. G. COLLINGWOOD; J. J. VAN NOSTRAND; V. M. SCRAMUZZA; and ALBERT GRENIER. 672 pages. Now out of print.
  - IV. *Roman Africa*, by R. M. HAYWOOD, 120 pp.  
*Roman Syria*, by F. M. HEICHELHEIM, 133 pp.  
*Roman Greece*, by J. A. O. LARSEN, 240 pp.  
*Roman Asia*, by T. R. S. BROUGHTON, 420 pp.  
Indices. 950 pages, \$5.00.
  - V. *Rome and Italy of the Empire*, by TENNEY FRANK, 461 pages.  
*General Index to Volumes I-V*, 146 pages. 2 volumes \$5.75.
- 

## ARISTOTLE'S CRITICISM OF PLATO AND THE ACADEMY, Vol. I

By HAROLD CHERNISS. 637 pages, \$5.00.

## ARISTOTLE'S CRITICISM OF PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

By HAROLD CHERNISS. 432 pages, \$4.00.

## THE SYNTAX OF THE GENITIVE CASE IN ARISTOPHANES

By JAMES WILSON POULTNEY. 250 pages, \$3.50.

## SELECTIONS FROM THE BRIEF MENTION OF BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

Edited with a biographical sketch and an index by CHARLES  
WILLIAM EMIL MILLER. 546 pages, frontispiece, \$4.50.

## STUDIES IN HONOR OF HERMANN COLLITZ

By American and foreign scholars. 341 pages, frontispiece, \$5.00.

## L'AGNIHOTRA: Description de l'agnihotra dans le rituel védique

Par P.-E. DUMONT. xv + 225 pages, \$3.00 paper and \$3.50  
cloth.

## L'ĪŚVARAGĪTĀ, LE CHANT DE ŚIVA

Texte extrait du Kurma-purāṇā. Traduit du Sanskrit par P.-E.  
DUMONT. 251 pages, paper, \$3.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18



